

536 Oct. 1937

JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

VOLUME V

1937

PART I

SHARING THE BIBLE IN STRANGE TONGUES*

PROF. S. RALPH HARLOW, *Smith College*

WE who have on our desks and in our libraries beautifully printed copies of the Scripture in various editions can hardly appreciate the problems which confront the one who goes out to teach the Bible in a land where there is not only no single page of Scripture in the native tongue, but where there is not even a written language.

Such has been the experience of a host of men and women whose great aim in life was to share the Bible with others who had not as yet heard the message contained in the Gospel. They set themselves to the gigantic task of learning a strange tongue, reducing the new language to writing, and then putting it into letters and form worthy to interpret the story of God's redeeming love.

How lightly and casually we have accepted our own heritage! We take for granted what cost others their very lives. We must needs go back to the reign of Henry VIII to glimpse something of the grim but glorious history which gave us our English Bible. In the upheavals of that age old landmarks were being blotted out, and men were facing on the high seas and in political councils new adventures. Columbus had opened up a vast new continent; Gutenberg had made possible the unlimited extension of literature and learning through the printed page. Luther had struck his great blow for freedom and men were compelled to rethink the meaning and signif-

icance of religion in terms of the New Testament. Wiclif, the first translator of the whole Bible into English, was persecuted during his life, and after his death was condemned as a heretic and his bones were dug up and burned. His translation was in manuscript form only, so had little circulation, though his example and efforts were a beacon light to those who came after him.

Then came Tyndale. To Tyndale, that gifted Oxford scholar, the supreme need was that his countrymen might have the Bible in their own tongue. He was forced to work in exile. After incredible trials and hardships, he managed, in 1526, to smuggle into England a few thousand copies of his new translation. Outlawed and hunted, betrayed at last by a false friend, Tyndale went to the stake, praying, "Lord, open the eyes of the King of England".

The name of Coverdale is immortal because he gave us the first complete Bible printed in the English language. Risking his life again and again, for a time in exile from England, he pressed on with his great task till he had completed that which he set out to accomplish.

How great indeed is our debt to these men who struggled with the Hebrew and Greek texts that they might offer to us the Gospel in our own loved English. Counting their lives not dear unto themselves, they were forced to flee from city to city, endure poverty, languish

* President's Address at Annual Meeting.

in prison, suffer hangings and burnings, that they might pass on to us this treasure which is the basis and the tool for our life work as teachers of the Bible.

Today the risks are less, but the problems still remain difficult, demanding patience and high courage in giving the Bible to others in their native tongues. Consider the task which has already been accomplished. In over 175 languages the Bible has been translated and published, while in 208 others the New Testament has been completed. Over 520 other groups have the Gospels or other portions to the extent of at least a single book, while 75 language groups have selections only. No other book in the world has been translated into so many languages as has the Bible. "Pilgrim's Progress", which comes next, is far behind the Bible.

It is difficult to keep accurate statistics of this translation and publication work because a new language is added to this list, on an average, every six weeks. In other words, there are 978 languages and dialects into which some part of the Bible has been translated. This means that every continent, every country, and multitudes of the islands of the sea are represented. Yet there remain hundreds of languages more in which no Scripture has yet been translated, and still more that have as yet only one or two Gospels or less.

One need hardly defend this gigantic task to a group of Biblical instructors. We might, however, pause and ask ourselves the question as to why the Bible has been so translated, and what some of the problems are which the translators and teachers of the Bible face in the carrying out of this task.

We would affirm that the Bible is a universal book: a book for all mankind. It speaks directly and universally to men of all races and every civilization. The Hebrew and

Greek world, which gave birth to its message and ideas, could not claim it for themselves alone. Men in the heart of African jungles and men on the high plains of the Andes have been equally stirred by its challenge to sin. Reserved Anglo-Saxons and responsive Latins have been captured by its message and have offered their lives for the propagation of its Hope. In the libraries of great universities and under the palms of savage islands men and women have pondered over its contents and come back to its pages as sailors on a stormy sea head their ships toward the harbor's beckoning lights. Its writers deal with the deepest and most universal longings and aspirations of the human heart and mind. God has spoken to more souls through its pages than through any other book.

We who are teachers of this Book know how essential it is that its contents be available in the language of our students. Only dimly could they grasp the hidden meanings implicit in the thought back of the words of the Scriptures in a strange tongue. Helpful as it proves to show the implications in some Hebrew or Greek phrase in the original text, we know that only as our students possess the Bible in the princely language of the King James version or in the enabling phrases of a modern translation, can it have wide or useful significance. It is in our mother tongue that our finest thoughts are formed. How true of the deepest experiences of life! I recognized this in my years in Turkey. However well my students might know English, when they turned to prayer they talked with God in the language of their childhood. Lovers, long in this country, will turn back to their childhood's mother tongue when they strive to express their most tender emotions. The Bible is a book of the heart and the Scripture itself well expresses the ideal when it affirms "We hear them speaking in our own tongues the mighty works of God."

What are some of the concrete problems which the Bible teacher faces who would translate the Scriptures into the mother tongue of other people in far-off lands? Those of us who have lived and taught in such lands can appreciate this problem in a way that others can hardly comprehend. The terrific struggle to find the right word, the illuminating phrase that will carry the meaning of a thought to another mind in an alien tongue, is a problem which we have shared. If in some talk to children or in a college chapel one is confronted with such a problem, how infinitely greater grows the difficulty which besets the path of the translator, realizing his responsibility to untold thousands.

Picture yourself surrounded by people whom you do not understand and who cannot understand you, and imagine how long it would take you to learn their language without the aid of a dictionary, a grammar, or even an alphabet. Take for example the problem of a language such as the Zulu with its many "clicks"; or the Foochow dialect, which other sections of China speak of as the "bird language," so like the twittering of birds it seems to sound. Here the same syllable may mean six different things, depending on the tone in which it is spoken. Some languages produce complex ideas by adding several suffixes; others by heaping up prefixes; some add both; in some the order of thought is almost in reverse of that in others. What a long, patient, and skilled task is called for in reducing a language to writing!

Equally difficult is the task of finding the exact meaning of words—words that accurately interpret the passage of the Bible being translated. One translator worked for three years before she found the right words for "throne" and for "holy". I know of several missionaries who paid money for new words or collections of words. The translator must be thoroughly familiar with the text he is

translating, with the meaning of the words in his own tongue, and in the original Hebrew or Greek. The American Bible Society puts its imprint only on such copies of the Scriptures as represent most careful scholarship, and it has been found desirable that translations made for missionary purposes be made from the original Greek and Hebrew texts. An appreciation of the original rhythm, such as moves through the Hebrew Psalms, the Book of Job, and many of the stories and poetry of the Bible, is essential before one can make the same psalms and prayers sing and speak in another tongue.

Martin Luther made reference to this need when he wrote: "We have much difficulty in translating Job, because of his grand and sublime style. He seems to be much more impatient of our efforts to turn him into German, than he was of the consolations of his friends." Often Luther and his helpers would spend an entire day on one line. I know a group of Chinese translators who spent from five to six hours on an average for every verse. Of the Prophets Luther wrote: "I am now at work translating the Prophets. Good Heavens! how hard it is to make the Hebrew writers speak German! They resist our efforts. They don't want to give up their native tongue for a barbarous idiom, just as the nightingale would not want to change her sweet song to imitate the monotonous cuckoo."

It goes without saying that the translator must know the native language and idiom, and that he must understand the spirit as well as the letter of the language into which the Scripture is being translated.

Let us turn to specific problems. Dr. Fenn related to me at some length the difficulties the translator has in a country such as China, where a long established classical tradition and a high form of cultural language prevailed for centuries. The first translations of the Bible in China were made in this classical

Chinese which was the only form tolerable to the Chinese scholars who aided in the work. This was the high classical *Wen Li* which could be understood by comparatively few of the people. Later a Mandarin translation was made which could be understood by over three hundred millions. Dr. Fenn says that up till a few years ago this translation was spoken of with contempt by the scholar class. The problem of what may justly be considered "scholarship" is a problem not only in our university circles but in far off Cathay! This same battle between the classical and the colloquial language has been waged in the Near East. The translation of the Gospels into the Greek vernacular has caused much bitterness, and during my own years in Greece was held to be anathema among the high ecclesiastical and scholastically minded groups. Yet the desire of the missionary teacher and educator has been to share the Scriptures with the common people in the language they could best understand.

Even when one is dealing with a spoken language one runs into constant difficulties. Take for example the word "brother". Among the Keres Indians of New Mexico, there is one word for the brother of a man, another for the brother of a woman, and a third for the brother of both. But the trouble does not end here. If he is a young brother it is necessary to use one word, another if he is an adult, and still another if he has passed middle age. As culture advances languages become more vague. This is true of English, which has a wide range of meaning and in which much is left to the imagination. The primitive languages are much more definite. There is a different word for each shade of meaning. How shall we translate: "I will be with you even unto the end of the world"? Take now the two words "with you". We discover that "with" has dozens of variations. In Keres Dr. Whitener, who has been translating the

Gospel with the help of an educated Keres Indian, decided to use the form which means "to go along *with* in dangerous places for comfort and companionship." This choice gave the word a power and beauty entirely lacking in the English "with". Turning to "you", we find that this is expressed in several forms, depending on whether we are speaking to one person, two, three or a multitude. In Keres there are hundreds of forms of the word "burn", depending upon what is being burned and who is doing the burning; while there are two thousand variations of "come".

On the other hand there are many words in the original text that have no counterpart in many languages. Here are a few examples in Keres. *Lord*. There is no similar word, so the word for "Chief" was used with a capital. *Apostles*. No parallel being found, the word applied to an inner council of elders who aided the chief was chosen. *Mustardseed*. Neither the plant nor the name is known among the Keres. They have, however, a plant, called "yaku", which grows from a very small seed into large stalks in which the birds nest. The use of this word makes the meaning of the passage clear to Indian readers. As in numbers of other languages, there was no worthy name for "home". The word for a man's house and a dog's house was the same. But the word had to be used, and the references to "home" in the Bible will fill a common word with a new and higher meaning. Among the Eskimos there is no word for "lamb" and no word for "shepherd". Both are unknown in that cold region where the Eskimos live. So the translator substituted the words for "goat" and "goat keeper". In the parable of the Great Judgment the "good goats" were separated from the "bad goats". This type of problem is common in many countries. How would you expect to find such words as "snow" and "ice" in the torrid regions of Africa, or the word for "kine" on a South

Pacific island where the largest animals ever seen are dogs and hogs? How would you render "flute, harp, sackbut, psaltry, and dulcimer" in a translation for the Samoyedes of Siberia, whose only music is the sorcerer's drum?

A problem one faces in a non-Christian community is the lack of words interpreting high spiritual ideals which do not exist, such as "God is a Spirit" or "God is love". Here the Bible translator is not confronted simply with the problem of conveying new ideas but of baptizing the strange vocabulary that it may become a fit instrument through which to proclaim the message of the Gospel and to speak the mind of Christ. Old records tell us that the early missionaries in England had to do the same for our own tongue.

In all vocabularies there are blanks. The translator has two ways of meeting this problem. He may borrow words from other tongues, or he may utilize the resources of the language itself by making new words from old roots or by extending the meaning of the new words. Dr. Erwin H. Richards, who spent fifty years in East Africa, gives us an intimate and interesting picture of the problems a translator faces among an extremely primitive people. He landed in Portuguese East Africa, a country sixteen hundred miles long, three hundred miles wide, and with three million people who had never seen a letter of the alphabet and who had never seen a written sign of any kind. He did not know a word of their language, nor did they know one of his. He had, however, spent four years in Natal and knew something of that language. In the crowd around his tent door he discovered a young man who knew a little of the Zulu language. Dr. Richards describes what happened. "I asked him in Zulu, 'How do you say in Tonga, 'Our Father who art in Heaven'? The Zulu is 'Baba wetu o sezulwini.' He immediately replied, 'Babe watu

a ku mo njajini'. We had translated the first verse in the Lord's Prayer. Then I went on, in Zulu: 'Ma li hlonitywe igama lako'. How do you say that? He replied: 'La ni rungujwe lina lako'. In an hour's time we had the entire Lord's Prayer translated into the Tonga tongue, the first time it had ever been uttered and put into ink in that language. The translation was so perfect that, in the more than two score years that have followed since we wrote it that night, only one single word has been changed, and that is the word which you yourselves cannot agree on—the word 'debts'. That prayer which we translated that evening of our first day in Tonga has been going over the country for four decades; and the people are still teaching it to their children."

When Dr. Richards started the translation of the Bible, he found that there was no word for "God". Throughout East and South Africa there was no word in the native tongues for "deity". They used the expression "Nkulu Nkulu" (the Great Great). That is a description but not a translation; and that is the name they are using for "God" in East Africa today. In Revelation mention is made of the "Great Bear". Well, there were no bears in that section of Africa, nor was there any other animal like it. The translators agreed to use the Greek word for bear which is "arktos", but they had to spell it "arkito" because a consonant and a vowel make a syllable in that language. Using an original Greek word says Dr. Richards, "made us classical, and very proud of our learning". But they did not put the idea across. One morning Mrs. Richards heard a native pastor delivering a very learned oration on this "arkito". Among other things he said, "Brothers, I do not know whether this is a big animal or a little one; I do not know whether he has fur or wool or hair; I do not know whether he has a long tail, a short one, or no tail at all; I do not know

whether he has teeth; I do not know whether he has claws, but he is all right, because he is in the Bible."

Some portion of the Bible has been published in over three hundred of these African dialects. At Yalembe, on the Congo, there is a mission station reaching tribes in which nine different dialects are spoken. What a problem for the translator! In a public service people are assembled who speak at least six mutually unintelligible languages. Is the Scripture to be translated into all of these tongues? The International Institute of African Languages and Cultures has said what seems to be the final word on this subject: "It is clear that to maintain in Africa hundreds of school languages, each with an educational literature of its own is impossible. For one who tries to understand the trend of modern development in Africa and is thinking of the future, the only alternative is either a vernacular literature in a limited number of important languages, or no vernacular literature at all."

The British Empire is a good example of the working out of this problem. Suppose, as was easily possible, that each of the main dialectical areas in the Empire had developed its own literature; would not this have made more difficult the welding of the people into a unity—the creation of the British race? It is this possession of a common speech and common literature that largely keeps the British Empire together.

In any study of translation problems there is much that is humorous. Dr. Gunn, who worked on translation problems in the New Hebrides Islands for a quarter of a century, relates numerous experiences in his search for words. He found great difficulty in discovering an equivalent for "trust". He writes: "I sought for words with as much eagerness as a boy will hunt for trout". For months he searched in vain before he discovered the

word he was seeking. When he began to fear that the language had no such word, he happened one day to be papering a room in his house. He was mounted on a long, rickety ladder, and was about to reach up and fix the paper on the top corner, when he heard one of the native workmen say: "If I were the missionary I would not *trust* this ladder; he will break his neck". Dr. Gunn dropped the paper and scrambled down the ladder, not because he was afraid of breaking his neck but in order to write down that precious word "trust".

Dr. John G. Paton, whom it was my privilege to know personally, could find no word for "trust" among the South Sea Islanders among whom he worked for half a century. He illustrated what he wanted by sitting on a chair, pulling up his feet, and bearing his whole weight upon the chair. He found a word which meant literally "to lean one's whole weight upon", and this was used in translating the New Testament. Thus, in answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" the Apostle's answer reads: "Lean thy whole weight upon the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved".

Constantly one must be on one's guard in this use of words, especially in coining new words. In the Kimbundu language of Angola the translators found a verb, "to love" (*Kuzola*), but no noun. They thought that by omitting the infinitive prefix *Ku* they would get the noun *Zola*. One day a teacher was speaking very earnestly, and repeatedly using the word *Zola*, while the natives sat completely mystified. Finally one of them turned to his neighbor and said: "I know what he means; he is talking about those big iron fish-hooks". *Zola* actually meant a hook of that kind.

There is an Italian proverb, "*Traduttore traditore*", which has much truth in it—that translation is impossible. For example, in

some of the languages of the South Sea Islanders, the pronouns have four numbers—singular, plural, dual, and trial—and the first person pronoun in each number has two forms—exclusive and inclusive. This causes much uncertainty in translation. For instance, take the words of the disciples to Jesus when they were in the boat: "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" (St. Mark IV:38). Before that can be rendered accurately into some of the South Sea dialects it must be decided how many people were in the boat, and whether the "we" includes Christ or not.

Doctrinal prejudices are apt to color or distort a translation where opportunity is offered for so doing. A Roman Catholic, believing that Mary bore no other child than Jesus, when writing the word for our Lord's "brethren" (as in St. Matthew XII:46) translates "brethren" with a word which means "brothers but not by the same mother". A Fundamentalist Baptist is careful to use the word which denotes complete immersion for "baptize". In several translations the word for "wine" is translated by a word meaning "unfermented juice".

However, actual fidelity to the meaning of the original sometimes involves abandoning literary fidelity. Rev. H. E. Maddox, who translated the New Testament into the Bunyoro dialect of Uganda, speaks of the impossibility of always translating uniformly. Take the word "carry"; you may carry a box, or you may carry a sick man; but if you use for carrying the sick man the same word you use for carrying a box, you would suggest that you were trying to balance him on the top of your head. Another example which Mr. Maddox gives us is the following: "When St. Peter was asked, 'Does not your Master pay tribute?' he answered 'Yes'; but if in the language of Bunyoro we were to translate 'Yes' by the equivalent for 'Yes', the meaning conveyed to a Native would be 'Yes,

he does not', because the word affirms whatever has gone before, including the negative. In this case the Greek 'Yes' must be rendered 'No' in order to keep the meaning of the original. We are to translate ideas rather than words."

Sometimes a political upheaval demands the rewriting of the entire Bible. This has recently happened in Turkey, where my brother-in-law, Dr. J. Kingsley Birge, is at work on the new translation of the Bible into Turkish. In 1928 Mustapha Kemal, now called Ataturk, the President of Turkey, as one of his methods of modernizing Turkey, prohibited the further use of the Arabic characters in which Turkish had previously been written, these characters to be replaced by modified Roman letters. Under the influence of Nationalism the vocabulary of the language is changing, becoming more Turkish and less and less Persian and Arabic. As the translation then in use was made by missionaries years ago, who were more familiar with Armenian than with Turkish, the necessity for making new plates, using Roman letters, was used as an occasion for improving the Turkish version of the Scriptures. By 1933 a completely revised Turkish New Testament had been published and the translators are now well advanced in a translation of the Old Testament.

We know the influence of an excellent translation of the Scriptures upon the literature and language of a nation or race. When I was at Columbia years ago there was a brilliant Chinese student taking graduate work, a young woman. She was a scholar in her own Chinese literature and was majoring in English. One day she came to her professor in English and said: "I have come on a mysterious fact in your language. Running through all your literature, whether it be in poetry or in prose, there are constantly recurring phrases which must come from a common source. There is nothing like this in our

Chinese literature. What is that source?" The instant reply was: "You must refer to our English Bible".

It can be affirmed that the translation by Gregory of the Armenian Bible, a very beautiful piece of work, helped enrich that language and that literature through the centuries. And, fortunately, one of the translations into modern Armenian is of a very high literary quality. When one is translating Scripture, because of the universality of the ideas and the high character of the thought, one is in a position to exert a lasting influence upon the language and literature of an entire race.

Adventure and romance are linked up with this business of translating the Scriptures. In 1857 Hirman Bingham started translating the Bible on the Gilbert Islands. In 1863 a small printing press was sent him, but no one knew how to use it. Shortly after, a boatload of shipwrecked sailors, who had been drifting for weeks over miles of ocean, landed on the beach near the Bingham's house. One of the sailors was a printer and helped to print the first copies of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John and the Epistle to the Ephesians, on the small supply of paper available. Forty years later Mr. Bingham completed the translation of the entire Bible. Mrs. Bingham read the proofs meticulously three times, and inserted 120,000 punctuation marks! The Bible was printed by the American Bible Society here in New York City. The Bible Society

now receives orders for the Scriptures directly from the Islands by radio. Heretofore it has taken from four months to half a year for such an order to travel from the Gilbert Islands to New York.

It is a glorious story, this record of the sharing of the Bible with many people in many tongues. Most of the work has been accomplished during the past century, in which, because of this desire to share the Bible, more languages have been given a written form than had previously been reduced to writing in all the history of the human race. The work still goes on. During the eighty years that passed after the appearance of the first Bible to be printed, which was in Latin, and before Luther made his translation into German, not over fifty thousand Bibles or parts of the Bible had been printed. Other books far outnumbered the Bible. But with Luther's translation the printing press discovered the Bible, took it on its wings, and flew with it over the face of the earth. In a few years the Scriptures were making their appearance in millions of copies each year. Surely it can be said today that "there is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth". We are honored in being associated with a host of men and women, teachers of the Bible, who have given their lives to the sharing of the Bible in a thousand languages.

IN DEFENSE OF THE TRANSLATOR AND OF NEW TRANSLATIONS

PROF. BEATRICE ALLARD BROOKS, *Western College*

THE article by Prof. Evert Mordecai Clark entitled "Some Stylistic Aspects of the Smith-Goodspeed Bible," which appeared in the last number of the *Journal of the National Association of Biblical Instructors* (Vol. 4 Pt. II) is thought-provoking. Prof. Clark's conclusion is that the translators of this Bible have not succeeded because they "projected an impossible and artistically unworthy task," a task which, he repeats, "was from its inception aesthetically if not ethically wrong." That their work is a complete failure he proceeds to show by culling, from here and there, illustrations by which he proves, to his own satisfaction, that the English style is so utterly corrupt that this translation will never become the Bible of common folk but that "only sophisticated minds will long continue to examine this translation as an interesting experiment and as a contribution to biblical research." And for this statement he makes no apology to English speaking Biblical scholars, whose knowledge of ancient languages has supposedly rendered them unable to write or appreciate dignified English!

Prof. Clark's language and vehemence in criticising the literary style of "the Smith-Goodspeed Bible" reminds one of Cochlaeus' famous criticism of Tyndale's attempt to give the scripture to the English people: "The New Testament translated into the vulgar tongue is in truth the food of death, the fuel of sin, the veil of malice, the pretext of false liberty—the milk of pride, the nourishment of contempt, the death of peace, the destruction of charity, the enemy of unity, the murderer of truth." The literary style of the late Prof. J. M. Powis Smith, Drs. Meek, Waterman

and Gordon, and of Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed, this Critic brands as "inaccurate, inelegant, colloquial, disreputably slangy, offensively coarse, indelicate, unpleasantly harsh-sounding, excessively euphonious, awkward, cacophonous, mean, ungrammatical, rhetorically bad, ambiguous and jerky." In short he maintains that the "Smith-Goodspeed version, with its pedestrian style, its words deliberately commonplace and low, and its sentences too often wordy, loose, ungrammatical, and devoid of balance, climax, harmony, or aphoristic force seldom charms the ear or stirs the heart." This is indeed a scathing indictment to prefer against translators of any "Holy Writ", and the method of the Critic should not go unchallenged.

It is undoubtedly true that a halo hovers o'er the King James Version. That it has so long been the sacred book of the Christian world, that countless souls have lived and died inspired by its words of exhortation and comfort, that it has become incorporated into about four centuries of church liturgy and of English literature is an impressive fact. It is small wonder that a professor of English Literature is loathe to have the phraseology of a source vary and it is indeed refreshing to find that there are still some teachers of Literature who not only recognize Biblical allusions, but attempt to help their pupils to appreciate them. There are, however, well-known and obvious circumstances which have led some twentieth century scholars, British and American, to attempt re-translation into English. These circumstances are familiar to Biblical students, and need not be enumerated here. Prof. Clark admits and assumes some of these reasons by quoting the translators' Prefaces in

which are set forth major reasons for a new translation and their aims as translators.

The present writer wishes to raise two questions: first, is anyone ever justified in judging any translation of any type of text into any language *solely* on the basis of its resultant literary style, with no cognizance of the original text; and second, has the Critic really proved that the translators have failed? It is obvious to anyone who has ever acquired even meagre skill in reading a foreign language, that a piece of literature loses something of its original flavor when attempt is made to express it in another language. No matter how laborious one's attempts to translate the Aeneid or the Odyssey, he has gained something which one who has read these epics only in translation has completely lost. Yet translations must be made, and the translator is confronted with an infinitely greater task than one who undertakes to express his own ideas in his native tongue. In theory, Prof. Clark admits these difficulties; again he quotes the Prefaces which mention them. Yet in his discussion he ignores the fact that after all the translator is attempting to reproduce, as accurately as possible, the mind and spirit of the style of the original text. If this be the ideal in translating secular literature, how much more should it be the ideal in translating Sacred Books? For in this case the translator must be especially on guard to give a clear, exact, and non-sectarian reproduction of the original. This problem both the Editors of this translation humbly recognized and stated. The Critic has ignored the fact that in introducing words and phrases which do not strike a responsive chord in his own memory, the translators did not change the language merely to disturb the mind of the faithful reader or to introduce something novel, but that they have made changes on the basis of their knowledge of the language of the text, their understanding of the culture

that produced it, and often their ability to reconstruct in their minds the occasion which brought forth the statement. They offer an independent translation, not a revamping or correcting of a previous English translation. It is just this fact which the present writer believes to be one of the outstanding virtues of the "Smith-Goodspeed Bible" as compared with certain other modern translations. That is, it is neither a too free interpretation of the original text, nor a patching of an old, even though well-loved, translation. It is a fresh attempt, which takes due account of previous translations and all manuscript sources. Our Critic, on the other hand, prefers a revamping of the old, and quotes, as his defense, Tyndale, the King James commission and the translators of the Revision of fifty years ago. It might be pointed out that a Certain Man once said (if this translation is correct and dignified!): "No one sews a patch of unshrunk cloth on an old coat; or if he does, the patch tears away, the new from the old, and makes the hole worse than before." It is possible that the same principle should be applied to translations.

By what criteria may we judge the style of any translation of the Bible? To begin with, it must be remembered that the Bible is composed of a variety of types and separate pieces of literature that were originally written down at various times over a period of at least nine centuries. Moreover, many of these separate pieces are in themselves composite and represent a weaving together of several style types; for example, the Pentateuch, the Book of Isaiah and the Synoptic gospels. Is the style (in Hebrew) of Isaiah the son of Amoz the same as that of the "Second Isaiah"? It is generally recognized that it is not. Is the style (in Greek) of Mark equal to that of Luke? It is often regarded as inferior, and to Mark's style are applied adjectives similar to some of those the Critic uses in describing the style of

this new translation. A point which the present writer wishes to make, however, is that one cannot, in judging a *translation*, totally ignore the original text, and in the case of the Bible, its styles of varying quality. That is the fact, and what is one to do? Should one improve the style of the original document? Possibly, if one is a professor of College English, but if one is a translator, *never!* It is interesting to note that so distinguished a contemporary literary critic as J. Middleton Murry not only recognizes that the Bible contains differing underlying styles, but that the Authorized Version is not, in itself, a work of homogeneous literary quality. He goes so far as to say, "When we consider style in the larger sense, it seems to me scarcely an exaggeration to say that the style of one half of the English Bible is atrocious—and nothing the translators might have done would have altered this."¹ Not everyone would agree to so large a percent, but the general fact may be conceded. One may not speak of the style of the Bible; there are a variety of types of style, which the translators are attempting to reproduce.

The translator of ancient, composite writing has a complicated task; he must not only faithfully reproduce the word sense, but do so by selecting from his own language words and phrases that are at the time regarded as good usage. He must also reproduce the spirit of the original style, whatever it is. The "Smith-Goodspeed Bible" is advertized as an "American Translation". It is well known that the American Revision of 1901 was unduly influenced by that of the English of 1885; it was not a fresh translation. The "Smith-Goodspeed" translators have attempted to exclude English words that are distinctly British, not American, in usage, and the New Testament translator has attempted to reproduce, (to

quote the Preface,) "something of the ease, boldness, and unpretending vigor which mark the original Greek. The writers of the New Testament had for the most part little use for literary art.—They put their message in the simplest and most direct terms they could command, so that it spoke directly to the common life of their day."

With these points in mind, let us examine Prof. Clark's method of criticism. He adopts as his definition of style that of Swift: "Proper words in proper places make the true definition of a style." This is of course similar to the idea of Flaubert and Walter Pater, "the one word for the one thing." It is possible that the ancient text may also have used "the one word", and that in so far as the Standard Versions have failed to reproduce correctly the sense by finding the right English word, the modern translator is bound to do so. As a dissector of English prose style Prof. Clark seems to be a past master; he uses the scalpel well. It is interesting to study his illustrations of the use of improper words and see that in every case the word in the Hebrew or Greek justifies or demands the change in translation. Space is lacking in which to mention his entire list, but a study of them indicates that his choice of illustrations has not been altogether happy as an aid in proving his point.

The form of comment on these illustrations will follow somewhat the method used by Prof. Clark, the phrase from the American Revision of 1901 (AR) to be compared will be in italics.

I. Illustrations of colloquialisms:

"There he squandered his property by fast living," (Luke 15:13) *And there he wasted his substance with riotous living.*

The average man commonly speaks of his "property", rather than his *substance*. "Fast living", a phrase so distressing to the Critic, seems to be good usage. "Fast" is listed as a

¹ J. Middleton Murry, *The Problem of Style*, Oxford 1930, Ch. VI.

synonym for "extravagant", "dissolute". It is not listed in the Oxford Dictionary as being in this sense either slang or a colloquialism.

"For I want you to know what a fight I am putting up for you." *For I would have you know how greatly I strive for you.* (Col. 2:1)

Objection is made that "scholarly St. Paul" is made to use slang and that the entire phrase has "the atmosphere of the prize-ring." But the AR ignored the force of the Greek word translated "fight." "Put up" in this sense has, according to various dictionaries, become good usage.²

II. Indelicate and coarse words:

There are words which the Critic says "will impress the most sensitive readers as indelicate." The principle illustration is the substitution of "intercourse" for the AR euphemistic word *knew* as in Gen. 4:1 etc. There are many stories in the Old Testament that are indelicate, so much so that had it not been for the belief that the whole Bible was the Word of God, and every sentence of equal sanctity, these passages would doubtless have been expurgated by ecclesiastical authority long ago. The early Old Testament literature, being a product of "Semitic" thought and not far removed from the thought patterns of the desert and primitive fertility cults, inevitably expressed much of its religious feeling in figures of sex relationships. It might be easy to delete indelicate phrases and stories, but what of the oft repeated figure of Israel as the unfaithful wife of Jehovah? "Israel has played the harlot and gone after other gods"; it is the framework of the book of Judges, the symbolism of the prophecy of Hosea, etc. The Critic does not seem disturbed by the presence in the AR of *harlot*, *virgin*, *eunuch*, *prostitute*, *whore*, or *conceive*. Yet each of these words has a specific connotation which is hardly more "delicate" than the illustration he cites. He has not noticed that in this new translation

many of these passages have been smoothed out: for example, Judges 2:17 "ran wantonly" for AR *played the harlot*; elimination of *whore* or *whoredom* as, Gen. 38:24, Ezek. 16:33, Hosea 5:4, sometimes substituting "apostasy". If Gen. 4:1 must be translated at all, is a euphemism better than a term technically applied to this phenomenon of life? To the adult the meaning is obvious with any translation and youth will speculate no more for reading a sociological term than a cryptic one. Nor will this word be any more disturbing than was *conceive*, which the Critic does not seem to have noticed as having been delicately eliminated by this New Testament translator, (cf. Matt. 1:18, Luke 1:24, 1:31, Rom. 9:10, Heb. 11:11).

The principal illustration of a coarse word is from the Sampson story:

"Then the Philistines seized him and gouged out his eyes." (Judges 16:21) *And the Philistines laid hold on him, and put out his eyes.*

The original verb (*naqar*) does not convey so tame an idea as "put out", of the AR. This idea may be "unpleasantly inelegant and coarse," but those were crude times. The translator may not civilize the characters.

III. Inappropriate words:

"Do not throw your pearls before pigs." (Matt. 7:6) *Neither cast your pearls before swine.*

"And he was ready to fill himself with the pods the pigs were eating." Luke 15:16 *And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat.*

The objection is that both these sentences are "excessively euphonious" and "amusingly alliterative". Certainly the word "pigs" is an improvement over *swine*; neither the farmer nor the announcer of live-stock quotations is in the habit of speaking of *swine*. The term *hog* would be no more elegant, possibly less so, than pig. As a matter of good style, could one ask for greater improvement than this new rendering of Luke 15:16; the elimination of the archaic "he would fain", and of so in-

² See Arthur G. Kennedy, *Current English*, 1935 p. 298.

delicate a word as *belly* (which has no equivalent in the Greek anyway.) The translation "pods" is accurate, the Greek word meaning specifically the seed pods of a tree of the locust variety. While the word *husk*, is not inexact as a term for any seed casing, it has so definitely become connected with corn that used in this sentence it is an example of a poor connotation.

IV. An example of inadequate connotation which is especially disturbing to the Critic is the translation "Jesus shed tears", for AR *Jesus wept*, John 11:35. He quotes Prof. Charles Dinsmore's comment on this change in translation, in which he observes that "crocodiles shed tears!" This seems quite out of place, and so far as the translation is concerned, the emotional habits of reptiles have nothing to do with the case. The verb used in this phrase means exactly "shed tears", it is the word from which is derived the noun "tear" (*dakru*). When the Greek reads *eklausen*, "he wept", Goodspeed so translates it, as in Luke 19:41.

A few illustrations are given of grammatical slips and poor word order, producing ambiguity. One may concede that it is probably better to so phrase Gen. 3:13 that the reader will be left in no doubt as to whether Eve ate the fruit or the serpent! Criticism of Matt. 6:34, however, is not really justified for the original and 1936 editions of the New Testament have the correct pronoun, "its"; the error is obviously a typographical one which crept into the 1931 printing of the complete Bible. Likewise it might be mentioned in passing that the only illustration of misspelling given, "avaracious", (Heb. 13:5) does not appear in the original New Testament printing, though it is in the complete Bible. In what book of over two thousand pages is one not likely to find type errors! It is contended that the sentences of the "Smith-Goodspeed Bible" are too wordy,

and examples are given to show that the AR states the same ideas in numerically fewer words. This is doubtless often the case, but one can also compile a list of sentences in which the new translation shows definite conciseness in comparison with the AR. For a fair judgment of this phase of the style an enormous number of sentences should be studied. The present writer has not undertaken this task and probably the Critic has not. Here also it would be necessary, not only to count the words in sentences in the two translations, but to judge each sentence *with reference to the original text*.

One might mention the other specific examples given, but it is not profitable to prolong unduly this type of criticism. "Presented in this rather unfair way, torn apart like the leaves of an artichoke," (to use an expression of T. S. Eliot³) the essential element of any style is lost. For the choice of words, the use of connectives, the sentence structure is not the sole basis on which to judge style. "Style is organic—not the clothes a man wears, but the flesh, bone, and blood of his body. Therefore it is really impossible to consider styles apart from the whole system of perceptions and feelings and thoughts that animate them.—Purity of language is a most unreliable clue to style."⁴ It is unfair to the translators of the "Smith-Goodspeed Bible" to examine the parts only, and not the whole. If one needs convincing, try this experiment. Forget that it is the scripture and that it is a new translation, read aloud without preconceived prejudice, such passages as the Song of Deborah, David's lament over the death of Saul and Jonathan, Elijah at Mount Carmel, Jehovah's answer to Job from the whirlwind, or parts of Second Isaiah. If you are honest, you will grant that such is great literature, as you have also thought the Authorized translation to be.

³ T. E. Eliot, *The Sacred Word*, 3rd ed. 1932, p. 4.

⁴ J. Middleton Murry, *op. cit.*, p. 136-7.

It is great literature because the underlying style is excellent, and because the faithful translator has reproduced not only the connotation of words, but the rhythm, and the balance; not only the mind, but the soul of the style. Or read in any of the synoptic gospels your favorite stories about Jesus, some of the parables, or the beloved chapters of the Fourth Gospel. How forceful is the Personality and how natural His conversation with His followers!

Conservatism is the chief obstacle to the appreciation of new art. Modern (not jazz) musical compositions are frowned upon by critics, both musical and non-musical persons, who do not listen with abandon void of preconceived ideas. They are so disturbed by the presence of intervals, chords, and time schemes not used by Brahms or Beethoven that they will not give themselves up to the theme and emotion of the composition. One may not call Stravinsky's style inelegant or crude merely because it is not like that of Beethoven. May one brand this American translation of the Bible as "vulgar jargon of the times" because its style is not like that of the 1611 British translation? Prof. Clark condemns the "Smith-Goodspeed Bible" because it does not, in his estimation, measure up to the King James or Revised Versions. His criticism seems to be based in part on his assumption that the Authorized Version represents a *summum bonum* of English prose style. This has been a common assumption against which J. Middleton Murry has issued a warning: "We have to be on our guard against the familiar suggestion that the English Bible is as a whole the highest achievement in English prose style. Not that I think this wholly untrue, but the manner in which the verdict is often pronounced seems to me dangerous. The Bible is a very heterogeneous book. Throughout, the Authorized Version has the high qualities of simplicity and firmness of phrasing. But

there is all the difference in the world between the underlying style of Genesis and Job and Matthew."⁵

Possibly enough has been said to indicate the fallacy of judging the style of a translation without reference to the original. Prof. Clark, however, has said that the translators of the "Smith-Goodspeed Bible", whom he refers to as "these gentlemen of notable and worthy parts", were "in several vital ways unfitted for their exacting literary task." To most of the readers of this JOURNAL, such a remark is amusing and hardly deserving of comment. The critic seems to have forgotten that at least one of these translators has received considerable recognition in the literary field, in addition to his position in the foremost rank of scholarship.

What will be the future of this or other scholarly, serious, new translations? One cannot with certainty predict; after all it is only about thirty years that "modern" translations have been available. It is undeniable that the greatest obstacle to their widespread use is the conservatism of all degrees and shades of Christians. They have been brought up on the words of the Authorized Text and they cling to it with an almost superstitious tenacity. This attitude toward new translations is as old as the fourth century. It is curious that persons who hold the most liberal as well as the most conservative theological ideas still wish their sacred text in the English of Tyndale, though few of them would ever think of reading any other sixteenth century English literature. The English of Tyndale set the religious vocabulary, now it has become a sacred language. People want their scripture in the same, familiar phraseology; it fits like an old shoe, it is comforting. In the light of the history of liturgy, it is safe to say that it will be a very long time before any translation, other than the Authorized or Re-

⁵ J. Middleton Murry, *op. cit.*, p. 127 ff.

vised will be generally used in church ritual. From the perpetuation of Sumerian liturgical hymns in Babylonian ritual to the continued use of Latin in the Roman Catholic service, it is evident that mankind has always clung to the old phraseology of worship expression.

Nevertheless, there is a definite utilitarian value in the new translations. Whenever a modern translation is read from the pulpit, it tends to wake up the congregation; because the words are not too familiar people begin to wonder. Ask, unexpectedly, any average group of college students what scripture was read at the day's chapel service. If it was the familiar version, a very small percent will know what it was about. On the other hand, if the scripture was read from a modern translation, a reasonable number will know what the passage was and most all will have recognized that it was "different". Give to a child a copy of Goodspeed's New Testament, or his *Junior Bible* to keep on his bookshelves along with his other books. The chances are the book will not collect dust as does the finest, black, limp-leather-bound text of the Authorized Version. He will take it off the shelf of his own accord because in this newer translation he encounters language he can understand; it more nearly fits his experience; the characters seem more real. He has no pious prejudice against the new translation. Yet the most conservative parent may rejoice that the child is here reading a translation of the original text of the Bible, not a paraphrasing or digest diluted for the junior mind.

The present day ignorance of the content of the Bible on the part of most people of Christian background has for some time been the concern of clergymen and many educators. It may well be that the use of modern translations as an integral part of our Religious

Education might contribute to the solution of this problem. If we could eliminate the prejudice of many of those who shape the Church School curricula, and of those who do the actual teaching in the Church Schools, and could give the youth of today a fair chance to acquaint themselves with the Bible, and especially the literature of the early church, in language more nearly related to their experience, there might gradually arise a generation of people who would be able to recognize Biblical allusions. This would indeed be a satisfaction to the Professors of English Literature as well as of Religion. It is interesting to observe the changing attitudes of college students toward new translations. Encourage a class to use the Goodspeed translation along with the AR for class preparation; most of them will approach the new with as much distrust as do older generations, but before long they will be using the new translation by preference.

This is by no means a plea for the elimination of the use of the Authorized Version; it still has its place. It is a plea that we give new translations a chance; that we use them for the enrichment of our understanding and appreciation of Hebrew thought and early Christian teaching. If we had some agency like the Gideon Bible Society, for example, to disseminate copies of new translations to all classes of people, the Bible might be read once more. It is possible that many persons will obtain a glimpse of the Kingdom of God from a twentieth rather than a sixteenth century translation. To conclude with the words of Coverdale in his Preface:

"Sure I am, that there commeth more knowlege and understandinge of the Scripture by their sondrie translacions than by the gloses of oure sophisticall doctours."

NEW LIGHT ON HELLENISTIC JUDAISM

PROF. ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH, *Yale University*

THE "new light" on Hellenistic Judaism which I am to discuss is a body of Jewish art from the Roman and Byzantine periods. It opens up a wide range of problems which must be understood before the significance of the art can be appreciated.

These problems are of the sort associated with the History-of-Religion School, and since that school is generally regarded with suspicion I must say a few prefatory words about it and its task. People of this school have wished to illumine the Old and New Testaments by adducing parallels in phrase or idea from pagan religions, but they have made little impression upon the thinking of scholars trained in other techniques. For one thing it has been easy to show that many of the so-called parallels were not parallels at all; and, in the New Testament field, especially, the difficulty has been far deeper than that of the validity of given parallels: it is the more general problem of the significance of parallels when and if they are established. For example, granted that certain ideas of Paul can be shown to resemble closely certain notions in the religions of Orpheus and Mithra, what does that resemblance imply? Any similarity must in the opinion of conservative scholars be taken to be mere coincidence, until some sort of connection between the two can reasonably be accounted for. That is, though I might be classed as a member of that school myself, I am convinced that we shall be beating the air so long as we continue to bring in parallels without facing the more important question of how young Christianity could have been affected by paganism at all. It must never be forgotten that parallels are lines which never meet. What is important is not whether paganism and Christianity had similar ideas,

but whether they ever met so that Christianity could have derived any such ideas from the pagans.

In trying to come to some agreement about the background of these parallels we must first find some major premises on which we can agree. First, there is the fact that Christianity grew out of Judaism, and never lost the sense of its Jewish roots. Its most ardent advocates called it the consummation of Judaism, the true Judaism. Second, it is equally well recognized that Christianity was steadily hellenized, even though we disagree on the extent of this hellenization. There is no dispute at all about the fact that the Christianity at least of Clement and Origen and their successors is hellenized as the Sermon on the Mount is not. We may ignore for the moment the question of whether the hellenization began with Stephen, Paul, the author of the Fourth Gospel, or with the Apologists of the Second Century, since we all agree that Christianity did not remain a sect of Palestinian Judaism, as it seems to have been at first, but took over many hellenistic elements as time went on. Third, it is equally evident that at every stage in the development of their religion Christians felt themselves bitterly opposed to paganism, especially to the Mystery Religions toward which in many ideas they seemed steadily tending. By the middle of the Second Century the Greek philosophers, particularly those in the Pythagorean and Platonic tradition, were regarded by the Fathers as being almost on a par with the prophets as divinely inspired precursors of the Faith. At the same time Christians felt nothing but scorn for the religions about them. Yet it is apparent that though Christians from Paul on always denounced gnosis, nevertheless

Christianity was interpreted as the true gnosis; though they despised the ceremonies of the Mysteries, their own sacraments were strikingly like them in many particulars; and though they alone, they were confident, had the true doctrine of salvation, that doctrine was far more like the doctrine of the Mysteries than like anything we know in their original Jewish background.

But there is a fourth fact on which we must agree, and which is the most perplexing of all, the crux of the problem of the origin of hellenistic Christianity, namely, that Christianity, in the process of hellenization, never disintegrated into a thousand sects. There is no doubt that a large number of sects or heresies did branch off from orthodox Christianity. In contrast to the adaptations of orthodox belief and practice, these sects have happily been characterized as "the acute hellenization of Christianity." But the conspicuous fact is that the tendency which produced these sects was never so marked that the Christian nucleus did not keep, in every stage where we have knowledge of it, an amazing sense of integrity. Only after this process of the hellenization of Christianity was completed did the great controversies arise which ended in a number of separate Christian Churches. In the early period, when Christianity moved out from Palestine to Ephesus, Rome, Corinth, and Alexandria, in mind as well as in environment, there were no controversies about the relation of Christians to pagan religions at the center of Christian orthodoxy threatening to dismember it. True, the Judaizing Christians tried to prevent hellenization altogether. But among those who were beginning to talk of Christ as the Logos, and to base salvation upon a sense of the corruption of all things material there was amazing agreement about what hellenistic conceptions were acceptable, and what not. Christ might become the Logos, but the attempt to

fit him into a gradation of powers with a female consort was at once and almost unanimously rejected. The struggle to keep the Faith from "acute hellenization" was a real one, as the *Didache* alone would suffice to show. But it was universally successful so far as we can see, to the point that controversies with Simon Magus and Basilides were external to the main Christian tradition as the later Arian and Nestorian controversies were not.

That integrity of orthodox Christianity throughout the years when it was being hellenized is the really great mystery of its early development. Why, if Christians were in any sense borrowing pagan notions, taking them directly from the pagans about them, were there not as many hellenistic Christianities as there were Christians under pagan influence? Why integrity instead of disintegration? Why hellenization, but at the same time a solid front against acute hellenization? For we can, indeed, get out our microscopes and show the differences between the Christianity of Paul and that of the letter to the Hebrews or of the Fourth Gospel, between Ignatius and Justin Martyr; still we have only to compare any of these with the fragments of the Gnostics to see that orthodox Greek Christian writers differ from each other much less fundamentally than they agree. Literary criticism has on this point tended to mislead us. For literary criticism of the writers of early Christianity has been chiefly concerned with emphasizing the unique features of each writer. Catholic and other conservative scholarship has often been more sound in stressing the central fact that the agreements are more fundamental than the differences.

Further, every early Christian document, besides being in agreement with the basic tradition, bristles with a sense of the importance of keeping that tradition intact. From Paul to the Fifth Century there is hardly a document

which does not set forth the extreme sin of modifying the Faith as once for all given. Indeed, in the earlier period, when there was no machinery of synods to banish heresy from the fold and define the orthodox position, there was a zeal for orthodoxy which no later age surpassed. From one generation to the next the hellenization was more marked, and yet within each generation appears the same sense of orthodoxy and fundamental unanimity. Always in contrast stand the heretics who showed what uncontrolled hellenization would have produced.

Whence came this change from the religion of Matthew to that of the Fourth Gospel, Justin Martyr, and Origen, a change without any sense of change; one in which everyone was denouncing the false gnosis and perversity of the Greeks, while learning to speak the language and assimilate many of the ideas of the Greeks? What guided Christianity in its steady march from the Sermon on the Mount to the theology of Clement, a march which it just as steadily denied it was making, since it abhorred all change? The stragglers who deserted only emphasize the essential unity of the army which moved together. How could Christians borrow while denouncing all suggestion of borrowing, and borrow with such amazing unity?

Only two explanations of this phenomenon seem to me defensible. One is the answer of the extreme conservatives, best expressed in the Catholic tradition that the Holy Spirit intervened miraculously to guide the Fathers into the truth, and to guard the Christian message and beliefs. For those of us who do not fall back at once upon a supernatural explanation there is but one alternative, namely that what seems a sudden and novel borrowing from the pagans could not have been so at all: there must have been some preparation in Judaism itself. The assured unanimity of Christians in their hellenization would, by the

very logic of the circumstances, force us to assume that many Jews had been quietly assimilating, little by little, what seemed to them the best of hellenistic civilization long before Christianity began. The early Christians would then only have had to find a place for Jesus Christ in the fusion of Judaism and Hellenism, just as the party of Peter and James fitted him at once into the Messianic Judaism of their own tradition. That is, if we knew nothing about Hellenistic Judaism, so called, we should be tempted to posit its existence to account for the way in which Christianity became hellenized.

For many reasons the hypothesis of such a Judaism in such an essential relation to the beginnings of Greek Christianity has played little part in our histories. Conservatives have felt an obligation to guard the novelty of Christianity, and liberals have been presented with no evidence that a Judaism which would answer this description ever existed. For while everyone has known about Philo, his treatises are so utterly different from any of the other written records of Judaism that to most people he has seemed a curiosity, an historical oddment, like Melchizedek without parents or children. To generalize from him to a Jewish school of his type of thought in Alexandria has been declared impossible by some of our greatest scholars, let alone to assume that Jews at Rome, Antioch, and Ephesus read the scriptures through similar Greek lenses. And when Philo was compared with Christian writers, literary critics could demonstrate contrasts without end. Hence, it is not surprising that a thorough study of Philo has been an exception rather than the rule in the training of scholars in Christian origins.

Still, while I cannot here debate the point, I am convinced that we shall be driven back upon the horns whenever we try to escape the

dilemma between a Hellenistic Jewish preparation for Greek Christianity, or else the appeal to divine miracle for the phenomenon. What is called for is not just a toleration by Jews in Greek countries of Greek notions, but a very specific and unified adaptation of certain aspects of Greek thought for their own use.

This line of thinking has led me time and again back to Philo to see whether, for all our great Philonic literature, he might not still have more to tell us than we had discovered. I was asked to speak to you this afternoon because some conclusions are beginning to take shape which, if valid, will put Hellenistic Judaism in a very different light, both for its own nature and its relation to early Christianity. My work is not finished; in a sense it is hardly begun. But, of a series of four or five volumes which will take the best part of my life to complete, the project has been announced, the first volume published, and the second volume, while a long way from being completed, is definitely taking form.

In the first volume, to which I have given the title *By Light, Light*, I have suggested that the real point of Philo's writings has been missed. He was not just allegorizing at random, but was presenting an elaborately conceived mystic Judaism, in which the Patriarchs, especially Moses, were the saviors of mankind. Their lives had shown men the way to God, and had made divinity accessible. As men became initiated into the lives of the Patriarchs salvation was brought to them. The Jewish Mystery seemed primarily a philosophic affair, not an elaborately worked out ceremony. Yet the simple rites of the Jewish festivals were transformed by allegory into mystic rites and sacraments. One reference to a mystic table from which uninitiates must be rigorously excluded suggests the possibility of a parallelism with the Christian eucharist, but one which, unfortunately, there is no way to substantiate or verify.

The most important similarities to Christianity are:

First, the fact that the Old Testament is made into a mystic document, in which the literal adventures of Abraham and Sarah, for example, have much less significance than their typological meaning. Whatever the differences in detail, this parallelism with Christian writers from Paul to Justin and Clement is unavoidable.

Second, the fact that salvation is made available to men by the great struggles or achievements of the Patriarchs whose lives are our patterns as they fought down the cloying power of matter and received the crown of victory, union with supra-material reality. Hellenistic Christianity had in Jesus Christ another protagonist in this epic struggle to take the place of the Patriarchs, but Christ was described like the Patriarchs in many points. For Christ was fundamentally an allegory of Jesus of Nazareth, in which the factual tradition was turned into a soteriological myth, or a metaphysical parable. Like Isaac and Moses, the Christ of orthodox tradition was made to be born of a virgin and gifted from the outset with a heavenly wisdom or omniscience which made the most learned teachers of his boyhood really his pupils. He was a link between men and God, to take them into a life lived no longer after the flesh. The allegory of Jesus followed the lines of Jesus' actual life, and hence different in detail from Philo's allegories of the Patriarchs which followed their stories, just as these Patriarchal allegories differed from each other. Indeed, one of the great cleavages of Third Century Christianity followed exactly the contrast apparent between Philo's own allegories of Abraham and Jacob as distinguished from those of Isaac and Moses. The latter two were the incarnate Logos, with no need of development or progress, no room for it since metaphysically they were, as Philo

says, perfect from the beginning. But Abraham and Jacob, like the Israelites as a whole, had to migrate out from the land of matter, and go on up to perfection by gradual stages; they were given their union with the Logos only at the end as a reward for their fidelity and victorious struggle. That is, Abraham and Jacob became the heavenly saviors of men by an adoptionistic process, while Isaac and Moses were such from birth. In other words, a difference which seems so profound within Third Century Christianity to Church Historians was not so great but that Philo could hold both positions at the same time.

One conspicuous difference between Philo's saving protagonists and the saving Christ is to be found in the fact that in the case of Christ the idea of salvation through the death and revival of the Hero was developed, although that notion is entirely lacking in Philo. This difference seems to me to go no deeper in its origin than the fact that the literal story of Jesus' life involved his crucifixion and a vivid conviction on the part of some of his followers that they had seen him alive after his death. Such incidents had to be included in the allegorization of Jesus, although they have no parallel in the allegorization of the Patriarchs because no similar happenings were related in the case of any of them. In all the differences, what we cannot forget is that Greek Christianity, in every document we have, was like the Hellenistic Judaism of Philo in being founded upon the mystic achievement of a man, one who, from being a human character about whom stories were told, became by allegory a heavenly protagonist and savior, the Logos among men, to lead men from sin and death into incorruptibility.

The Hellenistic Jewish allegory I have already published, and the ramifications of the Christian parallels are much too elaborate and difficult to present in a paper. But if the statements I have made about Philo's teach-

ings are true, and he does show such an elaborate assimilation of Greek mystic ideas of salvation in Judaism before Christianity, it is obvious that then we have at last something which corresponds to our logical demand for a Jewish preparation for Hellenistic Christian orthodoxy. Further, it is conspicuous that, for all the Hellenism in Philo, he has, when faced with Jews whose borrowings went farther than his, the same sense of orthodoxy, and at the same essential points, as had the Christians. That is, the Christian message in being hellenized needed only to be translated into the basic thought forms of Philonic Judaism, and did not have to begin for itself anew the problem of what elements to take in from hellenistic civilization and what not. It could continue with the sense of orthodoxy have, was like the Hellenistic Judaism of Philo

But before we may conclude that Christians did thus continue Hellenistic Judaism, a very serious gap in the evidence must be filled. For, if it be granted that I have correctly described the mystic religion of Philo, and that it was amazingly close to the mysticism of early Christianity, we have still to ask whether those ideas were limited to Philo himself. If they were the solitary creation of one without antecedents and successors, their resemblance to the ideas of early Greek Christians was probably mere coincidence. Were the lines of Philo's thought parallel to those of the first Greek Christians, or did they somewhere meet? There is no indication that any Christian had ever read Philo until we get to Clement of Alexandria at the end of the Second Century, so we cannot assume that his ideas reached Christianity in the early stages through his writings. I think it quite possible to demonstrate from his own treatises that Philo was not unique, but presumes throughout a similar mystic Judaism on the part of his readers. But was that mystic Judaism limited to Alexandria? The two

terms "Hellenistic Judaism" and "Alexandrian Judaism" have always been used synonymously. But if Hellenistic Judaism is to be restricted thus geographically to Alexandria, it is again vitiated as a source of any importance for Hellenistic Christianity, since there is no reason to think that Christianity had an important place in Alexandria, or Alexandria in Christianity, until long after the first and most essential steps in the hellenization of Christianity had been taken. If Hellenistic Judaism is to be taken seriously as a source for Hellenistic Christianity it must show some evidence that it was a wide-spread movement in the Roman world in general, so that it could have been present in the Judaism of Tarsus, Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome, if not in Palestine itself.

With this statement we have at last come to the "New Light" on Hellenistic Judaism. For I am convinced that there does exist a large body of evidence, not yet considered, for precisely this wide spread of Hellenistic Judaism. That evidence is the Jewish art remains of the early Christian centuries, a body of art which I wish briefly to describe to you, since its very existence is little known among scholars.

In the early Seventeenth Century, when the Christian catacombs were first being systematically studied, a Jewish catacomb was found at Rome. That it was Jewish could not for a moment be doubted in view of the great number of inscriptions, and of symbols such as the seven-branched candlestick which accompanied them. But it was not until about eighty years ago that important finds of Jewish Art really began. Then an amazing second catacomb came to light, filled with frescoes of the most completely unexpected kind. In one room a ceiling had groups of figures, cupids, peacocks, ducks, designs with fish, and in the center a figure of the goddess of Victory crowning a naked young man. On

the sides were two representations of Pegasus, a cock with snakes, and a sheep with a milk pot and the caduceus of Mercury. In another room were similar designs, centering in a figure of the goddess of Plenty or Fortune, with a cornucopia. From this catacomb came more than 150 unmistakably Jewish inscriptions with Jewish symbols, as well as a Medusa head worn as a talisman round the neck of one of the bodies. Probably from here too came a fine fragment of a sarcophagus on which the Seasons are represented with their symbols, while two winged Victories hold a seven-branched candlestick between them, cupids sport on little animals, and three of them press out wine. The sarcophagus seems to be not later than the middle of the Second Century after Christ.

The inscriptions in these catacombs are very simple, naming the person buried with his or her age, sometimes naming a father, husband, or wife, and occasionally noting the person's official title in the synagogue. The inscriptions are for the most part in Greek, though frequently in Latin; none is, at this period, in Hebrew or Aramaic, but often the phrase *shalom* or *shalom al yisraël* appears as a rubric at the end. That is, the inscriptions are of a type which could be used by people of any religion, and which was soon to be very popular with the Christians.

Then other catacombs were found, most of them with important decorations or symbols, but still with the same colorless inscriptions. They were found in Rome, and a large number in Southern Italy. The early ones had the inscriptions in Greek or Latin, the later ones, that is those dating after the Seventh or Eighth Centuries, were in Hebrew or Aramaic. Other interesting objects were found in the earlier catacombs. There were sarcophagi fragments on which were respectively a griffin, a dancing maenad, tragic and comic masks, a hunting scene, a set of four

figures of the seasons, a lion's mask of the type common in Syria for the Sun God and also on Christian sarcophagi, and one with the portrait of a child playing with a dog. No other portraits on sarcophagus were found, but one fragment shows a hand which must have been part of such a portrait. There were also very mysterious fragments of gold-glass goblets, of the sort frequently found in Christian burial places with definite eucharistic association. Those in the Jewish catacombs were just as clearly Jewish, though their use is not specified. There were also many lamps decorated with Jewish symbols.

Other catacombs were found in Sicily, in Sardinia, in the neighborhood of Carthage, and at Alexandria. From one of the four Jewish catacombs in Malta comes a lamp on the bottom of which, while the clay was soft, a seven-branched candlestick, lulab, and shofar (or some other object) were scratched, while the top was stamped with the Roman figure of the lares, two snakes at either side of an altar.

In North Africa the first synagogue was found, one with a mosaic floor containing a dedicatory inscription in Latin calling the building a "Sancta Sinagoga." The inscription is flanked with seven-branched candlesticks. Above the inscription is a peculiar design of great fishes in water with ducks and a strange wheel. Below it two peacocks stand by an amphora represented as a fountain, and flanked by palm trees. At the right and left are large formalized designs of the mystic vine growing from amphorae, making a pattern of open spaces in which are various birds, a hare, a lion, and two baskets of bread or fruit of the kind familiar in early Christian art. There was considerable controversy as to whether the building must not be considered a Christian church in spite of the inscription and candlesticks, but such resistance quickly dis-

appeared, and it was admitted that the mosaic must have come from a synagogue.

At Carthage one Jewish catacomb still showed faint traces of a design in which an elaborate vintage scene had been represented, and goddesses of Victory held up from either side a central medallion whose contents are lost.

While these discoveries were rapidly being made, but separately, and published in widely scattered periodicals, Palestinian exploration was steadily going on. Discoveries here have been even more amazing than those in the Diaspora. For here a great number of tombs and catacombs were found, many of them without any decoration, but many of them decorated. For the most part the decorations of the tombs were simple, with a Torah shrine, or a seven-branched candlestick, lulab, or ethrog, if anything at all. But also the vine motif was very frequent, often with birds eating the grapes, and in one, near Jerusalem and probably Jewish, with two winged Victories supporting a wreath which surrounded a Greek inscription: "This is the House Eternal." These art types might still be regarded as aberrations of individual Jews, as they usually were considered by the archaeologists who discovered them, if synagogues, which certainly represent the formal Judaism of a community, had not appeared, one after the other, with similar designs. Carved on the synagogues of Palestine from the Second to the Fifth Centuries of our era appear lions, centaurs, griffins, Medusa heads, animals of all sorts, clean and unclean, cupids with garlands, winged Victories, the lion's mask, birds, and, most common of all, the mystic vines, in which birds eat grapes, a motif expressed in one case in a series of vintage scenes carved on a synagogue border. One of the frequent symbols on the synagogue is the eagle, spread-winged exactly like the solar eagle of the Syrians about them.

These were perplexing enough until after the War synagogues were found in Palestine with mosaic floors. One showed Daniel beside a lion; he must originally have stood between two of them as in the early Christian representations. But four synagogues had in the middle of the mosaic floor a great zodiac with the twelve symbols frankly depicted and named in Hebrew, the four seasons shown as females at the four corners, and in the center a great representation of the Sun God driving his four-horse chariot. Above these in one instance is a collection of Jewish symbols massed around a Torah shrine, and below is a crude representation of the sacrifice of Isaac. Inscriptions in these synagogues are sometimes in Hebrew or Aramaic, sometimes in Greek, and sometimes bilingual.

This amazing art has been found thus all over the Roman world. In addition to the fact of its existence almost wherever Jews lived in the ancient world, a number of its features are extremely important.

First there cannot be the least doubt that this is a Hellenistic Jewish art. There is nothing classic about it, but everything points to the syncretism of the Hellenistic Age. Certainly it is not a Jewish art in origin. The Jews themselves contributed their own cult symbols to the art, the seven-branched candlestick, Torah shrine, ethrog, lulab, shofar, and a few minor symbols. But they seemed quite indifferent, preeminently in Palestine, whether they had their own candlestick or a Syrian eagle over the doorway of their synagogues; in their mosaics they gave central position not to the candlestick or Torah shrine, but to the zodiac and Sun God. If such a mixture of symbols were found in anything but Judaism, archaeologists would take it for granted that the local religion was being fused with the hellenistic, especially with Bacchic and solar, religions of salvation, in the stupendous

mixing bowl of the hellenistic and Roman periods.

Furthermore, if any religion but Judaism were involved, it would be concluded, quite without protest, that this fusion was not a local thing, since, you must have noticed, the symbols and themes used in Rome are exactly those used in Palestine or wherever else the art is found. The vine or other Bacchic symbol, the winged Victory, the solar lion's mask, the Pegasus and centaur, the tragic mask appear with local variation, but with generally amazing uniformity throughout. That is, the vocabulary of this art is very limited. More variation of types is found in many a single house or shrine in Pompeii than in all the Jewish art of the period from Sardinia to Syria. This fusion of Jewish with pagan symbols would long ago have been regarded as proof of a religious syncretism, of importance for the whole Roman world, if any but Judaism were the eastern religion represented.

The reason why the total impression of the art has never been presented or felt is that it has never been collected. Found now here, now there, it has been published in a wide variety of forms, if at all, and with little attempt to put the various discoveries together. If any comment on the unexpected nature of the art was made, it was to the effect that the art had no symbolic value, or that it was the work of some unorthodox individual. For always the assumption has been that Hellenistic Judaism was localized in Alexandria, if not in Philo himself, and that all other Jews were invariably of the "normative" type set by the Talmud and its pharisaic predecessors. Even after most of this art had been found, people were still asserting that the Jewish prejudice against graven images was unbroken throughout history. A few Jews saw the impossibility of such an assertion, and have been trying to account for the art by a closer study

of the Talmud. But needless to say, in spite of the extremely interesting talmudic passages which are being brought forward, the Judaism of this art speaks a language hard indeed to harmonize with rabbinism. Talmudic scholars for nearly a millennium and a half had no need, to say the least, for eagles, cupids, winged Victories, or bacchantes, to symbolize their teachings or their hopes. And I am frank to say that I find it now quite impossible to translate one into the other.

We began this paper with the peculiar phenomenon of the rise of a Hellenistic Christianity which had from the beginning an integrating sense of orthodoxy. This led us on to see that, if the historian did not throw up his hands and appeal with Catholic tradition to a divine miracle to account for the hellenization of Christianity, we should have to posit a wide-spread Hellenistic Judaism which itself had taken on mystic form, yet which had evolved through many years a sense of orthodoxy prescribing definitely what sort of thing could be assimilated from Hellenism and what sort not. This Judaism could not have been limited to Alexandria, we concluded, but must have been spread over most of the Roman world. Logic drove us to postulate such a Judaism. Is it possible that Philo is the only important surviving literary exponent of this Judaism, but that such a Judaism did thus widely exist and produce this incredible Jewish art? If so, its importance for Christianity is at once attested by the fact that early Christian art simply repeats this Jewish art, with the omission of the distinctively Jewish symbols, just as the hellenistic ideas in early Christian documents seem to me but a repetition of those already expressed in Hellenistic Jewish writings.

Yet that this art actually was the creation of a hellenized Judaism in this sense cannot be assumed just because such an assumption would help our problem. Somehow this art

must be deciphered for its symbolism before we can assert that the missing link really has been found. It is with that problem of deciphering the symbolism that I am to be engaged for some years to come. Indeed in the symposium on Wednesday in the Society of Biblical Literature I am discussing more closely the problem of methodology for such deciphering.* Here it need only be said that, if the art means anything at all, I do not see, all things considered, how it can be made to mean anything but Hellenistic Judaism. For this art, it seems to me, Josephus and Philo alike give us the key in what I have elsewhere called the "Lower Mystery" of Hellenistic Judaism. Both agree in describing a mystic salvation based upon the symbolism of the objects of Jewish cultus. In their account the seven-branched candlestick represented the planets; the twelve stones of the ephod typified the zodiac; the four seasons, four elements, four directions of the compass were exemplified in the four main objects in the outer sanctuary of the tabernacle. In these basic symbols Jews saw represented the salvation they hoped to obtain by mystically identifying themselves with the universe and with the omnipotent life force of the universe, the Logos. There is no indication in Jewish literature that Jews equated the Logos and the Vine, but if that equation can be carried back from Christianity to Judaism the basic meaning of the symbolism can be made out with considerable clarity. I should only introduce confusion if I indicated how this worked out in detail, yet I am confident that this art not only has a meaning, but that it means and can only mean that the Cosmic or Lower Mystery, in which Jewish cultus was made into a Bacchic or Orphic doctrine and symbol of salvation, is represented in this peculiar blending of

* To be published in the June issue of THE JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE, 1937.

mystic pagan symbols with representations of Jewish cult objects.

But what of Philo's higher mystery, the mystery of the saving Patriarchs already mentioned? Into this matter I must go still more briefly. In short, what is conspicuous in this art for its general rarity is any representation of Old Testament heroes or scenes. One Daniel between lions had appeared, extraordinarily like the Christian representation, and one Sacrifice of Isaac. Then, four years ago, the Yale excavators at Dura on the Euphrates very dramatically discovered a synagogue whose walls were covered with Old Testament scenes and figures. The dado tied itself up with the Jewish art already known, for it was in general a pattern of leopards and masks alternating around the room. But above the dado was something no one ever dreamed of finding, more than thirty paintings, for the most part beautifully preserved. The date of this painting, done exactly between 245 when the synagogue was built and 255 when Dura was destroyed, is earlier than anything we can date with certainty in Christian art. At the same time no one could doubt, in looking at the Jewish pictures, that they are based upon a very long tradition in Judaism. Further there can be no doubt that this Jewish school of art was the ancestor of the early Christian representations of the patriarchs, so surprisingly common in the Christian catacombs.

What does it mean, this strange room which has risen from the dead and brought back a world that was forgotten? That is a large question, much too large to discuss in any but a volume, and one which will probably not be settled until many volumes have been written. At present I even hesitate to tell you what the scenes represent, since so many of them can be variously interpreted. There is one great narrative scene of Moses leading the Israelites out from Egypt, over the Red

Sea, and on to a strange scene whose meaning is not certain. There is an Esther scene, one of the finding of the baby Moses and his presentation to Pharaoh, two mysterious representations of temples, one the temple of the Jews and the other covered with pagan symbols. There is the scene of the collapse of Dagon before the Ark of the Covenant, which latter is being returned on the ox cart, except that in this scene Dagon has become a pair of deities, recognizably the deities of the pagans at Dura. Elijah brings the fire down from heaven, Jacob has his dream, and the Ark appears in the midst of battle. The most amazing single biblical composition is a great narrative picture running the whole width of the room, and giving in scene after scene the story of Ezekiel preaching to the dried bones, reviving them, but eventually suffering martyrdom himself.

The scene to which one's thoughts recur more often than to any other is the one in the center of all, a great reredos over the seat of the ruler of the synagogue or the Torah shrine, the first scene painted in the room, though altered after a few years. For here runs up our great vine again, with birds in it. Across it is an Orpheus, playing his mystic music to the animals. Below, Jacob confirms the twelve tribes, and by blessing Ephraim and Manasseh makes them, what they always were thereafter with Levi, thirteen. At the top is a great throne surrounded by the thirteen. Is it Moses on the throne, or David, or the great Messiah to come? Many will be the suggestions. But the scene as a whole can have point only if we begin, not with our preconceptions of Judaism, but with the Orpheus whose presence in the Synagogue and in such a prominent position makes all preconceptions worthless. For the Orphics taught that they were leading men up to a great throne on which sat God. Mystic Jews had adopted this Orphic figure in the Sibylline Books, and in

one document Moses in a dream is taken up to occupy this throne himself as a part of his divinization. That is, we know that Jews had taken over from the Orphics the notion of the great throne of God, taken it over in Orphic hexameters. Of course Jews had long been talking of the throne of God, and Isaiah had described it with its seraphim. But these are not seraphim who surround the throne at Dura: they are thirteen men in Persian costumes, and, in view of the scenes below where Jacob blesses the tribes, they can represent only the thirteen tribes of Israel. The picture is stamped for its Orphicism by the picture of Orpheus himself, and the vine goes well with Orphic hope. If the scene be taken to represent the mystic power of Israel before the throne of God it has, on the whole, a coherent sense which no other explanation yet suggested gives to it.

That is merely a suggestion of how we may eventually come to understand the pictures in the Dura synagogue. I am not interested now to tell you prematurely my own still hypothetical guesses at the meaning of the scenes. The point which I have been trying to keep

before you throughout is that it seems to me we have in Jewish art a whole body of material to throw light on Judaism and the origin of Christianity, material which has never yet been used for that purpose. We must be extremely cautious, particularly to develop a rigorous methodology. All I wish to say to you today is that to begin by assuming that "Normative" and Talmudic Judaism produced this art is as fatal as it is utterly unwarranted. Whatever this art may mean, it seems in complete contrast to the religion of Akiba, as that religion has just been so beautifully set forth by Rabbi Finkelstein. On the other hand, that the art means nothing at all, is purely decorative, becomes just as impossible an hypothesis when one begins to appreciate its great quantity, its wide extent in time and space, and above all its rigid and universal conformity to type. It is useless to ask ourselves why the art was used if we begin by limiting ourselves to what we thought about Judaism before this art came to our knowledge. We have found a new book in a strange language. Our new challenge is to find out what it means.

THE STUDY OF RELIGION AS AN INTEGRATING DISCIPLINE

PROF. DAVID E. ADAMS, *Holyoke College*

HISTORICAL study of the various religious systems of the world seems to indicate that religion in its simpler stages represents the effort of man to relate himself in some intelligible way to the universe in which he finds himself, and especially to those aspects of it which baffle his immediate understanding or efforts at control. His efforts to understand, explain, and control his environment are inextricably linked with his religious institutions and practices. For centuries the church was the center of intellectual endeavor, the patron of the arts,

the initiator of social and economic experimentation. But as these manifold functions have developed in their own right with the growth of modern civilization, the picture has profoundly changed. As the church ceased to be the center of education and intellectual effort, these functions became differentiated into distinct and separate fields. The development of the sciences became entirely separated from religious institutions and from the traditional forms of thought which they represented. Philosophy and psychology developed along lines quite inde-

pendent of the historic expressions of religion. Sociology and economics dealt with a world conceived in terms almost wholly strange to the thinking of the church. These and many other fields of thought and investigation became separated from the institutions of religion as a natural result of the gradual secularization of education. But that very separation has sometimes led students to overlook the significant interrelations which do and always must exist between religion and every other field of human thought. Our modern division of the fields of human knowledge, for the purpose of accurate study, is an oversimplification of the picture of human experience tending to lead to an unsatisfactory and inadequate intellectual result. We have gone far with analysis in the whole field of human knowledge, but have as yet made almost no progress with synthesis. Is it possible that the study of religion might be so conducted as to serve this purpose in a tentative way in the mind of the undergraduate student? The sharp departmentalization of the average college curriculum serves to emphasize this artificial division into fields of study, and far too many students fail to find the significant interrelationships which underlie their separate studies because they never pause to examine human experience as a unit, or to realize that in a certain sense all the diverse fields of investigation are but aspects of man's experience of his world, approached from different angles. There are so-called "orientation" courses, to be sure, but too often these consist, again, of brief introductions to the separate fields by specialists in those fields, and lack the unity of an intelligent synthesis. Doubtless the student is supposed to make this for himself, but how can he be expected to do this when the specialists themselves give no indication of an awareness of the profound interrelationships between their apparently quite separate spheres?

It may seem presumptuous to suggest that a study so little regarded in many institutions of learning as is religion today, could serve this purpose. But it is certainly true that there is no important field of research, the results of which do not have significant implications for religion; and it is equally true that intelligent religious thinking cannot possibly ignore the bearing of any field of endeavor upon its own progress. Probably no teacher of religion is himself competent to make an adequate synthesis—but the teacher of religion can at least suggest to the thoughtful student that religion offers a useful basis for such a synthesis in his own thinking, and can help him to catch a glimpse of a possible integration of experience by pointing out some of the deeper interrelationships of science and philosophy, for example, with that total personal adjustment to his universe which each must eventually make, and which has commonly borne the name of religion.

One is impressed at times by the almost pathetic cultural barrenness of many students specializing in narrow fields of study, a barrenness due in part at least to lack of historical perspective which a real understanding of the historical roots of their own fields of study would tend to overcome. And such a study might well lead in turn to a deeper realization of the interrelations between the sciences and the social sciences, and those fundamental problems of mental and moral adjustment in human experience as a whole, with which religion has always dealt. While it is true that religion carries the student far beyond the exact areas of these various disciplines, and beyond the combined area of them all, it does not therefore lack the scientific spirit in its approach to life as a whole. And because it does try to deal with life as a whole, not as an abstraction or a theory, but as men and women must live it in the visible world of the present century, it has the power

to stimulate and to contribute insights into reality which give new meaning to all man's researches in specified and delimited areas. The study of religion may well be for many individuals the integrating discipline which fits

together in some sort of a tentative pattern the scattered fragments of the jig-saw puzzle which the curriculum of a modern institution of learning scatters upon the table before the expectant eyes of its students.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE—(INTRODUCTORY)

PROF. J. W. FLIGHT, *Haverford College*

NOW that archaeology has proved itself the most useful handmaid in the service of Biblical scholarship, it is altogether appropriate that this JOURNAL should devote a special department to the subject of archaeology and the Bible.

It will be the purpose of this department to disseminate news from the archaeological front, to bring to the attention of readers the most recent and illuminating articles and books in this field, and to discuss occasionally special topics bearing upon the subject. We shall endeavor to encourage in every possible way the utilization of the rich stores of informative materials coming from archaeology to the notice of Biblical students and teachers.

To this end the editor of this department bespeaks the cooperation of members of N. A. B. I. and readers of the JOURNAL in canvassing the field, and asks them to send in such items, notices, book-titles, reviews and archaeological discussions as seem worthy of mention in the JOURNAL. They may aid also by requesting information on special topics or asking for amplification of such points as seem to them to deserve fuller treatment.

Historical study being of primary importance to the Biblical field, archaeology in Bible lands is rightfully becoming more and more the research laboratory for this aspect of the student's interest. Not only so, but the enthusiastic response of student groups to archaeological study proves that it makes a fascinating appeal to them.

And now, in introducing this department in the new Quarterly JOURNAL, we may perhaps be permitted to start somewhere near the beginning by saying a word about the history of archaeological research in Palestine and the wider Near East.

The record of truly systematic and scientific archaeological investigation in that part of the world goes back only about forty-five years. Up to 1890 nothing in this recently-developed discipline can really be called "scientific archaeology". To be sure Edward Robinson and Eli Smith, who may rightfully lay claim to being the pioneers of Palestinian archaeology, did some of the first scientific surface exploration in the late 1830's. The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, together with the American Schools of Oriental Research, plans in 1938 to observe fittingly the centenary of Robinson's initial contributions and his heroic service in the early years of archaeological endeavor in Palestine. His recording of ruins above ground and of names of towns was astonishingly accurate and is still extremely useful.

F. J. Bliss in his "Development of Palestine Exploration" tells an interesting story of the earliest efforts to examine the ground. Records of pilgrims to the Holy Land, from Byzantine times down to the nineteenth century, yield further information, and some travelers' notes are available which give occasional materials often valuable to later researches. There is, of course, a great

difference between critical and uncritical travel and exploration. The uncritical traveler often does not distinguish between fact and fancy, nor does he recognize values in what he sees and records.

In the early days of actual excavation many mistakes were inevitably made, due to the crude methods employed and the lack of adequate criteria by which to judge values and to distinguish between the significant and the insignificant. Some of these mistakes it has been possible for later investigators to correct, but many of them have caused unfortunate and irreparable losses to scholarship. Even in more recent times there have been instances of excavations which have yielded much less than might have been expected, because of insufficient skill, inadequate knowledge, experience or training on the part of the excavators. Once a site or level is cleared, its contributions to scholarship are available only through the records of the excavator; and if these are not thoroughly, carefully and skillfully executed, the evidence is destroyed beyond recall.

Accurate chronology, that *sine qua non* of scientific historical study, was difficult if not impossible until dependable methods and standards were worked out. In Palestine the most important contribution to this aspect of the work was made by Sir W. M. Flinders Petrie, the noted British Egyptologist, who in 1890 undertook the excavation of Tel el Hesi (at first wrongly identified with Lachish). In a scarp section produced by the action of water, several levels of occupation of the tel were plainly visible, as well as artifacts (principally sherds) belonging to the peoples who had inhabited the various levels. Sir Flinders noted the differences in pottery from earlier to later times, observing that some of it was like that of 18th Dynasty of Egypt; and thus he first revealed the possibilities of dating by pottery. Since that time strati-

graphical study has been quite fully perfected, so that at present it is possible to work out synchronisms in the chronology of various sites in the same or different countries of the Near East. Thus the lowly potsherd has come into its own again after centuries of oblivion; and now its service is infinitely more important than before the shattering of the vessel to which it first belonged. It furnishes the most valuable criteria available for the archaeologist's time-sequences.

It might be said in passing that, in addition to the excellent volumes available for the study of particular sites already excavated, one of the most useful aids for teachers and students would be a small but representative collection of sherds illustrating the peculiarities of materials and manufacture of pottery in different cultures.*

Indispensable, of course, to any person or group beginning the study of Biblical archaeology is a small nucleus of books on the general subject and on a few specific sites. The editor can perhaps do no better than to refer the serious reader to the list of books, as well as the method set forth by Professor W. F. Albright in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 52, December, 1933, pp. 12-15. The article is entitled "How to Study the Archaeology of Palestine." In the same issue of the *Bulletin* is another similar article on Mesopotamian archaeology by Professor E. A. Speiser.† Also to be highly recommended is the excellent article on "Recent Discovery in Bible Lands" by Prof. Albright, which appears as the introduction to the latest edition (1936) of Young's Concordance. Here one can find

* The Haverford College Palestinian Museum, Haverford, Pa., will be prepared in the near future to send out such small collections of sherds for loan to Biblical instructors in colleges, schools or churches. These sherds were found at Beth Shemesh during five campaigns (Prof. E. Grant, Director) and illustrate certain Biblical backgrounds of the bronze and iron ages (c. 2000 to 500 B. C.) in Palestine.

† Copies of this issue of the *Bulletin* may be had from Mr. Lewis Moon, Executive Secretary of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 409 Prospect Street, New Haven, Connecticut. Twenty-five cents for the *Bulletin* or ten cents for a reprint of each article.

the most recent summary of Near East archaeological activities and their significance.

In the next appearance of this department in the JOURNAL we hope to list a number of

the older books in the field as well as some of the more recent ones, and give titles of some of the most useful periodicals treating various phases of Biblical archaeology.

EDITORIAL

The Annual Meeting

The high spots in the business transacted at the annual meeting were the following items that indicate the steady growth of NABI and its JOURNAL. First, the report of the secretary announcing the addition of ninety-four new members for the year; second, the organization of a Mid-West Branch of NABI, third, the change of the constitution defining the professional character of the membership of NABI but making room for others interested in and qualified for promoting its objects; and fourth, the change of the JOURNAL into a quarterly under the new name JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION.

Members who were not present at the meetings will be interested in reading the reports. What they will have to read between the lines is the warm interest in the discussions and the enthusiasm for the cause.

The Expansion of the Journal

With the new issue as a quarterly under its new name the JOURNAL enters the fifth year of its history. The years past have brought their lessons, one of which is if you are alive you have to keep moving.

The change into a quarterly was the result of a natural process of growth and will, it may be confidently expected, place the JOURNAL on a level with the magazines of its kind; give evidence of vitality; allow for and encourage more prompt interchange of opinion; and bring closer fellowship.

The change of the name of the JOURNAL from the Journal of the National Association of Biblical Instructors to the JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION indicates a broader scope in its mission. While retaining its mission as the official organ of the Association, its appeal goes now beyond the limits of the membership of the Association to the wider circle of those who are interested in what is going on in the biblical field. Its purview is to embrace not only the professional but the non-professional reader who has a vital interest in the cultural and religious aspects of the methods and results of academic study and teaching of Bible and religion. This is, however, to be effected not by curtailing its specific professional trend, but by making that accessible and vitally interesting to the growing number of those who want to and should be acquainted with modern views of the Bible and religion.

The secondary title of the JOURNAL, namely, A QUARTERLY DEVOTED TO ACADEMIC STUDY AND TEACHING OF BIBLE AND RELIGION, defines more distinctly the specific sphere of the JOURNAL. It excludes technical elements of original research which by mutual understanding falls to the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. On the other hand, it brings into prominence our unique function to center our interest in the Bible and in religion in so far as it relates to the religion of the Bible. This, broadly speaking, marks off our part of the vast field of the discipline of religion, confining it to the philosophy of religion, comparative religion, and the moral and

spiritual aspects of religion. It leaves us with our chosen distinction from such other objects as are pursued by journals of religion or journals of religious education in that we, as they do not, concentrate our primary effort on the Bible. We do not duplicate: there is no other journal in this country that espouses this clearly defined field of Bible and religion; and, on the other hand, there is no field that requires and deserves more specialized effort for cultivation.

This then we reiterate is our unique and otherwise unespoused and imperative function. We advocate the right of the Bible and religion to a place in curricular courses as essential to a well-rounded education. We still stress the acquisition of the original languages of the Bible as an incomparable aid for its better understanding. In an age that shows strong tendencies toward mechanistic and utilitarian outlook, we stand for a proper educational balance by stressing the cultural values that contribute to social and ethical character building. We define with due discrimination the rightful place of the Bible, the great English classic, as literature, history, and religion in the science of life. We believe in and defend in our study and teach-

ing the scientific methods that have brought rich results in other branches of learning. Our aim is increasingly and more effectively to represent an organized body of thoroughly trained specialists, the product of the scholarship of our best institutions of learning, whose task it is to form a well-grounded public opinion and offer guidance in the field of Bible and religion as understood in the light of present day knowledge.

To do this with efficiency and more representatively, the JOURNAL broadened out its editorial policy by the appointment of a managing editor and a group of departmental or contributing editors to have charge of various branches of activities the details of which may be seen with other announcements of importance on the inside cover page containing the rostrum of NABI and the JOURNAL.

The choice of books is a matter of great responsibility. To render better service herein is the object in the appointment of contributing editors to furnish occasionally selected bibliographies of the various parts of our field. Our book review section is edited with the same point of view. The book reviews are not merely announcements or generalized commendations but critical estimates by special-

ARE YOU NOW UNEMPLOYED OR SEEKING TO RE-LOCATE

If so you will do well to communicate with the chairman of the committee on Vacancies: Ivan G. Grimshaw, 2757 Fairmount Boulevard, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

In keeping with a vote taken at the annual meeting of the association this committee is planning to send to all the presidents of colleges having departments of Bible and Religion a list of the people enrolled with the committee giving a brief statement of their qualifications. (No actual names will appear; numbers being used). In case of a vacancy those qualified will be informed immediately.

A note to Dr. Grimshaw will bring you a registration blank by return mail, and insure the inclusion of your record.

ists with view to aid in the selection of textbooks and collateral reading.

All this is written for the purpose of obtaining for the JOURNAL the right kind of co-operation on the part of the members of NABI. This is all the more necessary in view of our expansion. The JOURNAL offers itself anew to be the forum for discussion and the instrument for the expression of our findings; and we repeat our request for the submission for publication of papers by mature students.

The JOURNAL is not a commercial enterprise and has no agents for its propagation other than the membership of NABI. The officials of the Association and the editors of the JOURNAL have no obligations that other members do not share. Our further growth is dependent upon the cooperation of our membership; and how to arouse the sense of obligation is a vital question.

The action to make the JOURNAL a quarterly is so far only for one year and carries with it the limitation of not to exceed forty-eight pages per issue. All this is due to the wise caution of not expanding beyond our

resources. The membership of NABI has it in its hands to make the action permanent and enlarging the size of the JOURNAL. All proceeds go into the expansion of the JOURNAL; and it means: The more income, the more JOURNAL.

There are various sources of increasing our income:

1. The treasurer was "authorized to receive voluntary supplementary dues for the year 1937." This points the way to gifts toward expansion.
2. Increase of membership in NABI from professional colleagues and others "interested in and qualified for the promotion of its objects."
3. Subscription to the JOURNAL by academic and public libraries and individuals interested in the subject of Bible and Religion.

Each member of NABI should feel the obligation to make the effort in one or all directions.

"So we built the wall . . . for the people had a mind to work."

ISMAR J. PERITZ.

THE ASSOCIATION

Report of the Secretary for 1936

The members of the Association number 514 at the present time.

Applications for membership have been received from 94 persons during the year 1936. These applicants have been admitted to membership, subject to approval by the Association at this meeting.

The Outline for a Course of Study, published in its revised form about a year ago, has received wide distribution. 409 copies have

been sold. Quantity orders have been received from a number of schools, including The Masters School, Knox School, St. Agatha's School, and St. Anne's School.

Letters written to the Secretary suggest that other courses of study, if compiled, would meet a need.

The organization of a mid-western branch of the N. A. B. I. has been effected. See report by its secretary below.

Respectfully submitted,
Carl E. Purinton, Secretary.

The Annual Meeting

The twenty-seventh annual meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors was held at Union Theological Seminary on Monday and Tuesday, December 28 and 29, 1936. The four sessions were well attended. The program was as follows:

MONDAY MORNING

- 10:00 A. M. Report of the Secretary
Report of the Treasurer
Report of Editor of the Journal
Committee Reports
- 11:00 A. M. President's Address, "Sharing the Bible in Strange Tongues (Translation Problems of Biblical Instructors)"—PROFESSOR S. RALPH HARLOW, *Smith College*. Luncheon in Refectory Cafeteria.

MONDAY AFTERNOON

- 2:30 P. M. "New Light on Hellenistic Judaism."—PROFESSOR ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH, *Yale University*.
"The Academic Challenge to Biblical Instructors" — DR. GOULD WICKEY, *General Secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education*.
- 4:00 P. M. Discussion
- 6:00 P. M. Dinner in the Private Dining Room of Refectory (Cafeteria Style)

MONDAY EVENING

- 7:30 P. M. Panel Discussion on Curriculum—GEORGIA HARKNESS, *Elmira College*, Chairman; DAVID E. ADAMS, *Mount Holyoke College*; RUTH ALMA ECKHART, *Council of Church Boards of Educational Survey*; ERDMAN HARRIS, *Union Theological Seminary and Law-*

renceville School; CHARLES D. MATTHEWS *Birmingham Southern College*; A. KATHRYN ROGERS, *The Masters School*.

- 9:30 A. M. Business
- 10:00 A. M. "An Experiment with Elective Courses," DR. PAUL BRAISTED, *Mount Hermon School*; "The Aims and Methods of Jewish Adult Education," DR. TRUDE WEISS ROSMARIN, *The School for the Jewish Woman*.

The following matters of business were transacted: the report of the secretary was read and approved. The applications of 94 persons for membership were accepted. The treasurer's report was read and approved. An auditing committee consisting of E. W. K. Mould and H. L. Newman was appointed which reported that it found the treasurer's books in order and commended the treasurer for his faithful work.

A letter was read from Dr. Grimshaw, chairman of the Committee on Vacancies, in which instructions from the Association were requested for further procedure. It was voted that the committee should continue its work for another year with the suggestion that information about available candidates be sent to presidents of institutions where courses in Bible and religion are offered.

C. W. Quimby, chairman of the Committee on Teaching Materials in Church Schools, reviewed the findings of the committee presented at the 1935 meeting and stated that he had no suggestions to make for the future procedure of the committee. The committee was discharged from further duties with an expression of the appreciation of the Association.

Dr. Peritz presented a recommendation that the JOURNAL be published as a quarterly under the title, Journal of Bible and Religion. After

discussion, it was voted that the JOURNAL be published as a quarterly for the next year.

It was voted that the N. A. B. I. recognize the Mid-west branch and send its greetings.

The following changes made in the Constitution by the Executive Council upon recommendation of the Committee on Constitution were approved by the Association:

Article II

Read first clause: "The object of the Association shall be to work for more effective instruction in Bible and Religion, etc."

Article IV

Read first sentence: "Membership in the Association shall be open to those professionally engaged in instruction in the field of Bible and Religion, and to others specially recommended as qualified by the Executive Council." Omit "qualified" in last clause but one of Article IV.

By-Laws

Article V

Read at end: "best advance teaching in the field of Bible and Religion."

The Committee on Constitution recommended the following changes to be acted upon at the 1937 meeting:

Constitution

Article III

After Vice President, read: "A Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, and ..."

Article IV

Omit second sentence: "Graduate . . . membership."

By-Laws

Article II

Omit Article II as it stands, and substitute therefor:

"It shall be the duty of the Recording Secretary to keep a record of the proceedings of meetings; to preserve an accurate roll of the members; and to report annually on the condition of the Association. It shall be the duty of the Corresponding Secretary to inform members in advance of each meeting

concerning the program; and to conduct the correspondence of the Association."

Article VII

Omit: "except that . . . one dollar."

Submitted

George Dahl, Chairman

H. T. Fowler

J. Muilenburg

In view of the fact that the amendment to create the office of Recording Secretary cannot be acted upon until the next meeting, it was voted to authorize the Nominating Committee to appoint a Recording Secretary for the coming year.

The Nominating Committee, consisting of D. E. Adams, chairman, A. Kathryn Rogers, and E. W. K. Mould, presented the following list of nominations:

President, Frank G. Lankard, Brothers College; Vice President, Paul J. Braisted, Mount Hermon School; Recording Secretary, Marion J. Benedict, Sweet Briar College; Corresponding Secretary, Carl E. Purinton, Adelphi College; Treasurer, Rev. Leon A. Davison, Blair Academy; Chairman of Program Committee, Mary E. Andrews, Goucher College; Associate in Council (1937-39), S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College. The nominations were approved.

It was voted that the treasurer be authorized to receive voluntary supplementary dues for the year 1937.

Dr. Peritz recommended that a recommendation be made to the Executive Council that a commission be appointed on Bible teaching in public high schools. It was so voted.

It was voted that thanks should be expressed to Union Theological Seminary for its hospitality.

Appreciation was expressed of the work of the continuing officers and of the work of the program committee.

Respectfully submitted ,
Carl E. Purinton, Secretary

Meetings of Executive Council

After discussion and modification of the recommendations of the Committee on Constitution with regard to revision of Article IV and correlated provisions of the Constitution and By-Laws, it was voted to present the matter to the Association for final action.

The recommendation of Dr. Peritz that the JOURNAL be published as a quarterly under the title, JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION, was also referred to the Association for decision.

Subsequent to favorable action upon the above mentioned proposal, the executive council approved the following list of editors: Prof. Ismar J. Peritz, Editor; Prof. Carl E. Purinton, Managing Editor; Prof. Henry A. Allen, Lafayette College; Prof. George Dahl, Yale Divinity School; Prof. Sophia Lyon Fahs, Union Theological Seminary and the Riverside Church; Prof. John W. Flight, Haverford College; Prof. William E. Hunter, Presbyterian College for Christian Education; Dean Albion Roy King, Cornell College; Mr. David R. Porter, Headmaster, Mount Hermon School; Dr. Robert H. Pfeiffer, Harvard University; Prof. Mary E. Andrews, Goucher College, contributing editors.

The appointment of a commission on Bible teaching in public high schools was approved and referred to the chairman of the Council.

The chairman of the program committee was authorized to fix the date of next year's meeting after consulting with officers of the S. B. L. and E.

It was voted to authorize the treasurer to pay the travel expenses of Miss Eckhart from Washington, in view of her important contribution to the panel discussion.

Respectfully submitted,
Carl E. Purinton, Secretary.

Report of Treasurer, 1936

Balance Forward Dec. 1935 \$ 167.28

Receipts

Dues and Arrears	\$983.80	
Advertising in the Journal	92.80	
Sale of Outlines and Units of Study	104.85	
Sale 7 Back Copies of Journal	3.50	
Overpayment from former Treasurer60	
	<hr/>	
	\$1185.55	\$1185.55
		<hr/>
Total Receipts		\$1352.83

Expenditures

The Corse Press:

Printing Journal, Vol. 3 Part 2	\$282.16
Printing Supplement Units of Study	81.14
Reprints Constitution — Programs	11.50
Postage, etc.	32.97
3000 Letterheads and Postage	20.45
Gov. cards, corrections to mailing lists	16.84
Printing Journal, Vol. 4 Part 1	269.99
Printing Membership Drive letters, An- nouncements, etc.	70.66
Printing Journal, Vol. 4 Part 2	258.75

Total Corse Press:1044.46

The Blairstown Press—Bill

Heads, Envelopes	10.50
Charles Scribner's Sons, Mailing list and postage	48.32
Dr. Hunter, Postage Pro- moting Western Unit ...	13.14

Committee on Objective Methods in Education ..	5.00
Travel-Secretary and Treasurer to Business Meeting	1.75
Travel—Speaker to two Annual Meetings	27.32
Clerical Expense	3.50
Telegram40
Balance Paid for Printing Old Units of Study73
Office Supplies	5.32
Handling Stereopticon 1935 Annual Meeting	1.50
Postage — Statements, Correspondence, Mailed Matter	88.37
Editorial—Dr. Peritz, Mimeograph, postage, travel	26.00
	<u>\$1276.31</u>
Total Expense	\$1276.31
Balance	\$ 76.52
At First National Bank—Blairstown	\$ 59.72
Cash on hand	16.80
	<u>\$ 76.52</u>
Respectfully submitted,	
L. A. Davison, Treas.	
Approved by Auditing Committee December 29, 1936—	
Prof. Elmer W. K. Mould	
Prof. H. L. Newman.	

Report of The Mid-West Branch

As arranged and announced, members of the N. A. B. I. met at the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, in an interval in the program of the Mid-West Branch of the S. B. L. & E., October 30, 1936. The meeting approved the action of the April 24 meeting in establishing the Section, and proceeded to organization.

Professors R. R. Brewer of James Millikin University, Beatrice A. Brooks of Western College, and William E. Hunter of the Presbyterian College of Christian Education were elected respectively president, vice president, and secretary for the ensuing year.

Details connected with organization were committed to the officers, as also the program, place and date of the next annual meeting and the developing of relationships with the S. B. L. & E.

There were present Professors O. J. Baab, R. R. Brewer, B. A. Brooks, E. E. Domm, M. H. Dunsmore, F. V. Filson, H. E. Foster, W. E. Hunter, B. L. Kershner, O. R. Sellers, F. W. Smith, E. E. Speicher, Leroy Waterman.

The officers invite the counsels of all interested persons on any matter connected with the development of the Section as a worthwhile institution.

William E. Hunter, Secretary

BOOK REVIEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Torrey's Aramaic Gospels
OUR TRANSLATED GOSPELS, by
Charles Cutler Torrey. Harper and Brothers,
N. Y., 1936, pp. lx, 172. \$2.25.
The idea of some sort of Aramaic fore-
runners of the Greek gospels is here to stay.

Dr. Torrey's particular development of it is not to be laughed out of court. His long years of scholarship, his fertile mind, his thorough linguistic control, place him above petty cavil, personal or institutional. Universal agreement is not to be expected, but

only unprejudiced criticism based upon equal scholarship and language intimacy will be adequate.

When Dr. Torrey published his *Four Gospels*, many wished that they might see the notes and text that led to his conclusions. This new volume is a peek over his shoulder. The contents are arranged in a suggestive introduction (pp. i-lx) followed by data and proofs cleverly arranged as a series of twenty-five "exhibits" of situations in the Greek text that seem to presuppose Aramaic originals. In part these exhibits concern ambiguities, the Aramaic interrogative form, conjunction and pronoun, vocalization, word confusion and corruption of text, omitted or inserted letters. In each case, Aramaic idiom, vocabulary or orthography immediately suggests a better reading or solution to an old textual problem. There is enough smoke here to indicate plenty of fire. The arguments can not be ignored.

The author contends, of course, that all the gospels originated in Aramaic, in Palestine, designed for local readers, to tell the good news that the Messiah had come in the person of the Galilean Jesus. Luke was Greek, but a good translator, preserving the original even where it made an awkward text. The gospel language is essentially like the LXX, Semitic tinged, and not a Graeco-Jewish jargon. Neither is it the Greek of the vulgar papyri. In fact, some of the "inexcusable" Greek of the gospels is "admirable" as translation, for it gives "exactly what was aimed at . . . the wording of the original text; any expert can restore the underlying Aramaic." (p. lviii)

Among the author's "exhibits" is many an illuminating item. An extra *yod* on Aramaic *neser* made the prophets predict Jesus a Nazarene, and no such item appears in the Old Testament. The original must have read "He shall be called the Branch," the very point

the gospel writer was emphasizing. Lk. 11:48, where the English Bible adds in italics "their tombs," is clarified when we remember the root "build" is used for offspring, hence "your fathers killed the prophets and you are children to them," i. e. chips from the same block. Simon was not a leper, but a jar seller.

The lack of the interrogative particle in Aramaic made Mk. 14:41 declarative. Surely Jesus did not command sleep and in the same breath arouse the disciples. It should read "Would you sleep now and take your rest? Already the time has come. . . ." Similarly Jn. 12:7 is a rhetorical question: "Let her alone; should she keep it for the day of my burial?"

The troublesome temptation phrases yield to the Aramaic solvent. "Lead us not into temptation" becomes "let us not fail in the test." So too Mk. 14:38 refers not to temptation but to the impending trial or testing: "Awake, and pray not to fail in the trial." The verb means to "enter" or "go under," as Assyrian *ereb samsi*, "going under of the sun." How vivid the phrase "Lest ye go under in the testing!" It removes a hoary stumbling block for theologian and layman alike.

Especially convincing is Torrey's comment on the garbled Mk. 9:49-50. The translators influenced by Isaiah's "fire" *'esh* in verse 48, rendered Aramaic *b'esh* "in fire" instead of its true meaning "spoiled." Then Lev. 2:13, a meaningless reference to a sacrificial rite, was inserted to support the error. In verse 50 *aslimu* was confused with "peace," but should read "hand on." Reconstructed, the hopeless text becomes vivid: "Anything spoiling is salted; have salt in you and share it." i. e. have that within you which keeps you untainted and share the blessing with others. It is good religion, and mightily constructive scholarship. It might be noted here that Mof-

fatt, drawing from oriental custom, made this passage refer to the primitive salt ritual—"let salt be between you," that is, be ever friendly and at peace. Such a rendering at least smacks of the orient; Torrey's has Aramaic foundation; both quite at variance with recently much-publicized "Aramaic" (really Syriac) gospels put forth by one having oriental and "Aramaic" background, who buried both talents in rendering this text.

This new volume will not end controversy. Too much was omitted. We need Dr. Torrey's whole *apparatus criticus*. But certainly every biblical student should become acquainted with these data. There will be found stimulation, enlightenment, and the thrill of real spiritual values.

Carl Summer Knopf, Dean
School of Religion, The Univ. of So. Calif.

GOSPEL LIGHT. By George M. Lamsa.
Holman, Phila. pp. XXXVII—401. \$2.75.

Another volume from the same pen and press that has already given uncritical readers a hopeless blend of gospel fact and fable. It would be a spiritual victory if someone could be found with the grace and persuasiveness to sit down with Mr. Lamsa and his publisher and persuade them to face facts. Lamsa could write acceptable stuff. He does have eastern background. He speaks a modern vernacular. Why must he stubbornly insist on confusing Aramaic, Syriac, Amoritic, Babylonian and Hebrew. Why, even though sincere, must he blandly support the primacy of Syriac and his Eastern Church, all in the name of "new" "Aramaic" light.

Unfortunately, Dr. J. P. Harrington of the Smithsonian in a foreward falls under the spell until even his English breaks down! No one should know better than he that 13th century Palestinian Aramaic does not survive in original exactness. There is no "miracle" of modern rediscovery. What does he think

Syriac scholars have been doing all these years? And then "the gospels were written for Semitics!" Maybe that is "original" English! Today we would say "Semites" and reserve "Semitic" for adjectival purposes and "Semitics" for the science itself. "Lamsa gives us the semantics of Semitics." Clever phraseology, but if true, Chicago, Pennsylvania, Yale *et al* had better close up. Dr. Harrington's friendship has been exploited to his embarrassment.

There is real merit in the volume. When Mr. Lamsa speaks of customs of his own country, it often sheds light. Jesus' divine power and teachings do rise above all barriers. Christianity cannot be understood without background. The remarks about eastern ideas of authorship and titles of biblical books need to penetrate many a literalist's skull. The comments on John's gospel are in part helpful, and with a little knowledge of other writers in the field could have been made better. One has the feeling that the author really means to shed light; that he is terribly in earnest about the gospels, his church and himself; but that his mind is absolutely closed to the world of scholarship.

The linguistics are hopeless. Consider such a series of statements as: "Hebrew" is the name of a race, not a language; (Correct.) On the cross inscription, "Hebrew" really means Aramaic; (Correct.) The Jews spoke Aramaic after the return; (Correct.) Hebrew was derived from Aramaic; (He means Amoritic.) The two are so alike as to be hardly distinguishable; (Tell that to a seminary student.) Abraham was an Assyrian; The Hammurabi code was in Aramaic; (Silly.) Such Aramaic continues to the present day.

So the story goes on. He is right saying that the Greeks borrowed the alphabet. He makes it Aramean and seems never to have heard of the Sinai finds. He confuses Nazarene and Nazirite, missing the real Aramaic

point on both. In Matt. 5 he treats *Raca* as Aramaic, and ignores *moreh*, for vernacular *lella*. He derives Sheol from *salal*, ignoring the *aleph*, and claims Greek gehenna as "Hebrew word for hell." Simon is still from Cyrene, an easily corrected error if the passage is written in Aramaic. Jesus is accused of fear in Matt. 26:41-46. The Kingdom of God and Kingdom of Heaven are differentiated and made largely apocalyptic, ignoring Jesus' plain statement that the Kingdom is within us.

The whole volume has so many possibilities, so many beautiful thoughts, so many helpful glints that reviewing it honestly is painful. It could be so fine, and yet is so obviously in the tone of a set of Sunday School helps, verbose, thin, unscholarly, preachy, and unauthoritative. American scholars and monographs are significantly ignored. If Mr. Lamsa would stick to customs and give up his preposterous linguistic claims, he could make a real contribution.

Carl Sumner Knopf

School of Religion, The Univ. of So. Calif.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE, edited by H. K. Luce, B. D., with Introduction and Notes (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges). 1936. Pp. XXVI 273. Cambridge: at the University Press. 6s. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$1.50.

Two generations ago the Cambridge University Press began issuing its "Bible for Schools and Colleges" and a parallel series called the "Cambridge Greek Testament." Most of these volumes are so far behind the times that many teachers must have welcomed the appearance lately of some entirely new volumes in the latter series, under the capable editorship of A. Nairne, beginning with the first three gospels. The third of these has now been reissued after an interval of three years, without any reference to the original publica-

tion, as a new volume in the Cambridge Bible for Schools. The requirements of the latter series involve the substitution of the English (i. e. British) Revised Version for Westcott and Hort's Greek text and the omission of notes dealing primarily with Greek expression or with the original textual authorities. Otherwise the commentary based on the English resembles almost exactly and verbatim that based on the Greek. In three years the author would have little occasion to change his mind or even to add from new sources. One may smile to note that Streeter's *Four Gospels* was described in 1933 as "indispensable," in 1936 as "almost indispensable," while Middleton Murry's *Life of Jesus* is no longer mentioned at all in the bibliography. But changes like that are hard to find, unless one goes at it like the collation of a manuscript.

Since the notes are identical, it is a pity that the new form omits the very illuminating brief preface, which described the book more accurately than any reviewer can hope to do. No doubt the publisher feared it would interfere with sales to learn that the writer "is not a professional theologian" but a schoolmaster, that the "notes have been experimentally inflicted" on school boys, or that "more and fuller quotations from other writers than is usual" have been given. These other writers are such English scholars as the recent commentators Easton, Creed, Montefiore, Ragg, and some in French (no German.) The theological standpoint is well suggested in the following note which I quote from the 1933 form:

The use of capital letters in pronouns referring to Jesus may perhaps seem inconsistent with the general theological position which this commentary takes up. I have retained them in the hope they may serve as a reminder that those who adopt a somewhat advanced critical standpoint may value no less highly than other Christians what Jesus' Life and Teaching has meant to mankind.

The notes are not merely on words and phrases but on each section as a whole and on

general matters. They call attention to the important problems and the accessible evidence. They are concise and judicious. The book—a full fifty years ahead of its predecessor by F. W. Farrar—may be heartily recommended for students (I assume no teachers with like limitations) who cannot operate with Greek. Those who can use Greek will get more for their money by buying instead the Cambridge Greek Testament. That has 100 more pages (partly due to better spaced type,) and costs little more.

Harvard University *Henry J. Cadbury*

STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Collected papers of Clayton R. Bowen.
Edited by Robert J. Hutcheon. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1936. VI-182 pp. \$2.

Clayton Raymond Bowen was one of those scholars who published few books, but whose informed and balanced judgments were eagerly sought by his fellow-workers in the field of New Testament study. When he appeared on the annual program of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis the members conversing in the corridors always returned to the hall to give him a close and attentive hearing. In 1924 he was president of this society. His untimely death in his late fifties was a distinct loss to the Biblical scholarship of this country.

The present volume gathers together nine papers which Professor Bowen had published in various journals. Although all of these are accessible in most theological libraries, this volume will have a double service. Teachers who find it difficult to use bound periodicals for assigned class reading will find this volume a practical means of making use of the essays it contains. It will also make available to ministers and others who do not have access to the technical jour-

nals something of Professor Bowen's scholarly judgment and religious insight.

Of the essays themselves, two are on John the Baptist, three on the Fourth Gospel, one on the place of Ephesians among the letters of Paul, one on the meaning of Acts I, 4, and two on the religious interpretation of the New Testament. Probably one of the latter will be of interest to the greatest number of readers—the brilliant paper "Why Eschatology". This article reprinted from the JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE is the best brief statement this reviewer has seen of the underlying significance and value of the eschatological beliefs of the New Testament. It alone is worth the price of the volume.

Duke University *Harvie Branscomb*

STUDIES IN THE LIFE OF JESUS.

Irvin Ross Beiler. Nashville, Cokesbury, 1936. Pp. 319. \$2.50.

Here is one of the best college textbooks on the subject. Professor Beiler has tested the material in class use. The book is designed for a semester. It has varied reading suggestions which cover not only the twenty-nine chapters but also the subheadings. Numerous questions appear both within and at the end of the chapters. These stimulating questions cover part of the Bible text, then reach out into pressing social issues of today and into wide-ranging religious problems and into literature and art. Many subject headings in italics guide the reader.

While the author modestly seeks to provide a mere introduction, based primarily on Mark and Luke, he covers the vital points in a study of Jesus. A chapter heading like "Did Jesus Observe His Teaching?" indicates the departure from traditional theology. On most questions a variety of viewpoints is given with a definite choice of the best one though occasionally the decision is left open. While the well-known outline of Jesus' life is gen-

erally followed, the gospel materials are collected primarily under topical headings, which could easily be studied in a different order from the present one. A liberal discerning mind, a clear often epigrammatical style, an engaging yet penetrating brevity, a thorough mastery of the subject, a wide range of reading, and a tolerant religious spirit impress the reader.

The section on the origin of the gospels seems too brief to prepare the student for the frequent distinctions between the words of Jesus and of the gospel writers. Consider what Goguel does on origins. Is it best to omit Form-Criticism entirely? In view of a certain theological development in all the gospels, the Virgin Birth might well be discussed early rather than at the end. And while the old harmony idea is gone, the Fourth Gospel should have more place. Some maps would help considerably. Several more books of importance on Jesus ought to be cited for reading.

Syracuse University *Dwight Marion Beck*

THE GREAT GALILEAN RETURNS:

A survey of the Eclipse and Rediscovery of Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom. By *Henry Kendall Booth*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936. XVI-218 pp. \$2.00.

The thesis of this book is given in the above subtitle. With extreme simplicity, clarity, and generality, the author tells the story of the "Man and the Message" which "have been forgotten until our day" (p. VII); of the transformation which the "Social Gospel" of Jesus suffered throughout the history of the Christian Church, beginning with the time of the Apostle Paul; and of the return of the Great Galilean, thanks to latter day science, biblical criticism, and social conscience.

The author describes Jesus as the Teacher "of the Kingdom of God—this transformed

society in which divine love should supplant human selfishness as the ruling motive of life" (p. 46). Confronted with Greek immorality, Roman militarism, social oppression and injustice, and the passion for liberation among his people, Jesus became the champion of the poor and "the forgotten man," and looked forward to the day when evil and misery would cease to exist upon this earth. It seems that Jesus expected the kingdom of human brotherhood to come through a "gradual growth into the fullness of Divine rule, in which God entering into human souls should create the Kingdom by contagion of character" (p. 43). "And this faith found its basis in Jesus' confidence in the limitless possibilities of men" (p. 51). The author believes that this Gospel of Jesus has come down to us in an expurgated form. But he seems to feel that he has reconstructed the original Gospel of Jesus with good success.

According to our author, the Social Gospel of the Great Galilean disappeared almost instantaneously. Paul changed the Gospel of Jesus into a Gospel *about* Jesus. Being a man who could not see "life and its issues clearly," he replaced the "elemental principles" of Jesus with "complex schemes of salvation" (p. 83). From this time on "vaporous theoretical ideas" multiplied, and a Christianity of "dogmatism and creeds" took the place of the Gospel of Jesus. Medieval Christianity, with its otherworldliness, sacramentarianism, asceticism, mysticism, and ecclesiasticism, which the author sums up in brief paragraphs, was completely alien to the real Gospel. The Reformation was only a partial improvement, because it failed to do away with authoritarianism, dogmatism, and otherworldliness.

Then came science, biblical criticism, and the social point of view. And lo, the Great Galilean was "raised from the dead" (p. 150). Jesus reappeared as a real man, as "the Master and Leader for today;" as the Teacher who

has a message which can do away with war and injustice in our day. So, the author confronts the reader with the "challenge" of the Gospel: "Why not then try Jesus' way of life," the way of good will, tolerance, kindness, helpfulness, and love? He seems to think that if a large enough number of "kingdom-possessed souls" and "the Church" do their duty with passion and devotion, "we may well be confronting one of the great turning points of history" (p. 207).

The earnestness of this book is praiseworthy. But as an account of historical Christianity and as an analysis of the problem of Christian living in contemporary society, it strikes me as superficial and misleading. The simple social passion of this book is a drug and not a panacea.

Wellesley College *Joseph Haroutunian*

OLD TESTAMENT RELIGION IN THE LIGHT OF ITS CANAANITE BACKGROUND. By *Elmer A. Leslie*. The Abingdon Press, 1936. 289 pages. \$2.00.

The problem of the influence of the religion of Canaan on the religion of Israel is not new and has often been investigated, but Professor Leslie of Boston University School of Theology has written a book on the subject that not only brings the investigation up to date by utilizing new materials, such as the mythological epics from Ugarit (Ras Shamra), but also reaches original conclusions.

The growth of the religion of Israel in Canaan is dominated by the susceptibility of the Israelites to their Palestinian environment and by a militant reaction against this alien influence on the religion of Jehovah. With Hegelian dialectics the author envisages this process as a drama of conflict and synthesis: the genuine religion of Israel from Abraham to Isaiah (thesis), the religion of Canaan (antithesis), and the final synthesis attained by the 7th century prophets and Deuteronomy

(reaching its apex in Ezekiel and Second Isaiah). "The freshest and most illuminating approach to the religion of Israel . . . is through a vivid sense of the clash, grapple, and interpenetration of the Mosaic religion of the wilderness with the civilization and religion of Canaan" (p. 15).

According to Professor Leslie the religion of Canaan was characterized by the warmth of the worshipper's relation with his god, by its intense emotional quality, and by its mystical apprehension of the divine: the central idea of this religion was fertility. The triad of Byblos, El-Kronos, Baalath (Astarte), and Adonis "was indeed central to all Canaan" (p. 230): the distinction of sex in the gods ("the masculine-feminine principle") and the concept of the dying-rising god (Adonis) were basic in Canaan. The idea of fertility dominates the whole Canaanitic religion: its pantheon, its myths, its worship of the dead, its festivals, its sacrifices (including the human ones), and even its sacred pillars of stone. Even ecstatic prophecy, that appeared in Israel under Canaanitic influence, is connected with fertility cults: ecstatic religion originated in Thrace, passed over to Greece as the Dionysiac frenzy, to Asia Minor as the worship of Attis and Cybele, to Syria as the cult of Atargatis, to Phoenicia and Palestine as prophecy. The Adonis cult has left echoes, according to the author (following in part Graham and May), in the books of Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Jeremiah, etc. Hosea and Jeremiah were particularly sensitive to the emotional strain in the Canaanitic religion and Second Isaiah derived from that source his teaching of Jehovah as the Redeemer and Savior.

In numerous matters of detail the views presented by Professor Leslie in this book are no less original than his general conclusions that have been briefly summarized. Even readers unable to agree with the author in his

interpretation of the religion of Canaan as a fertility cult and in his picture of the religious development of Israel, will find the volume stimulating and informing. Few significant works are missing from the rather full bibliography: J. Haury, *Das eleusinische Fest ursprünglich identisch mit dem Laubhüttenfest*. Munich, 1914; and R. Kittell, *Osirismysterien und Laubhüttenfest* (OLZ 27 (1924) 385ff), presents views similar to those of the author; Montgomery and Harris, *The Rash Shamra Mythological texts*, 1935; and Eissfeldt, Molk, 1935, may have appeared too late for consideration. The book can render excellent service in introducing students to recent investigations on the religion of Israel and to the bearing of archaeological discoveries on our understanding of the Old Testament.

Harvard University Robert H. Pfeiffer

A BASIC BIBLE COURSE FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS. Part I—To 586 B. C. By Elmer W. K. Mould, Ph. D. Pp. XXIV-209, quarto, with maps, tables, glossary, index. Lithoprinted, bristol binding, \$3.75. Available from Elmira College Bookstore, Elmira, N. Y.

Prof. Mould has provided a valuable textbook for the study of biblical history. He cannot be accused of having hurried this book into print. It was described in a paper read at the annual meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors in 1930. The book has actually been in process of writing and revision since 1923. The time and labor spent upon its preparation will seem amply justified to one who examines the book. Teachers will be impressed by the skill with which this course in the Bible has been planned; students who use it will find the study a most rewarding one. The present volume carries the history to 586 B. C. and is intended for a single semester's work; a com-

panion volume soon to appear will cover the work of a second semester.

This book is much more than a treatment of Hebrew history. It contains a wealth of material dealing with the geography of the Biblical world and particularly the geography and climate of Palestine; the peoples of the Bible; archaeological discoveries bearing upon biblical history; the development of Hebrew literature; and the growth of ethical and religious ideas in the Bible.

The uniqueness of the book lies in its cultural approach to Hebrew history. As Prof. Mould states in his preface, the book begins on the human interest level. In Chapter III, which deals with the emergence of the Hebrew tribes, the nomad and his way of life are vividly described, based upon a comparison to the modern nomads of the Syrian and Arabian deserts. In the chapter dealing with "The Winning of the Hebrew Homeland," there is a detailed description of the houses, household furnishings, food, etc., of the Hebrews. Such material helps the reader to visualize the Hebrew manner of life. Chapter XVII treats of "Hebrew Culture Under the Kings." Prof. Mould has apparently made considerable use of Bertholet and Oesterley and Robinson, but the reviewer knows no textbook in which the cultural aspect of Hebrew history is equally stressed. Students will require no urging to read such a text as this.

Considerable apparatus is provided with the book. The table of "Epochs of Biblical History" is an arrangement of stages of Hebrew political development in accordance with what are described as "Watershed Dates." The Battle of Carchemish in 605 B. C. is such a date. There is a chronological chart in addition. There are also five maps, a bookshelf, a glossary of technical terms, a table of literary types and a detailed index.

Adelphi College

Carl E. Purinton

THE LIVING BIBLE. *William Clayton Bower*. Harpers, 1936. IX-329 pp. \$2.00.

The ideal envisioned by Dr. Bower for the utilization of the Bible in religious education (and more specifically for guidance in personal religious living) is indeed a lofty one. But it is precisely the one which N. A. B. I. would wholeheartedly approve and assist. It combines intellectual competence in the knowledge of the best results of modern Biblical scholarship with a recognition and employment of five significant principles of procedure.

The book begins with four chapters on the place of the Bible in the modern world, the religious adjustment of the individual to his world, and the Bible as a resource for religious living. Then follow five chapters giving a rapid survey of the cultural and literary development in Old and New Testaments. Though necessarily brief, these chapters constitute a fine summary of some of the more important results of recent Biblical research. They should whet the appetite of the serious reader for the many specialized works available for further study of this field.

The last five chapters deal with the five principles to be observed in making the most fruitful use of the Biblical materials. Space permits only brief statement of these principles. 1) Beginning with people where they are: using the Bible as a fund of resources for interpreting, assessing and redirecting present responses to present, living interests, issues and problems. 2) The principle of reverse order: seeing the Biblical literature in its genetic order; tracing back the materials from end-form to origin; reconstructing the social situations out of which they arose, and entering sympathetically and imaginatively into the vital experiences of the living human beings to whom they were concrete in the first place. 3) The principle of relevancy: using the Bible selectively, in the sense of finding, in spite of

much that is frankly irrelevant to modern life, much that is still relevant to man's eternal spiritual quest set as it is in the midst of abiding inward needs, aspirations, issues, and values which remain astonishingly like unto those which faced men in the ancient world. 4) The principle of historical perspective: recognizing that the concept of process in history involves the distinguishing of stages, movements and changes in ideas and attitudes. 5) Recovering the religious values of the Bible: "abstracting these values from the concrete situations in which they arose in order to free them and make them available for use in contemporary religious experience."

This is a welcome and timely volume from a prominent leader in the field of religious education; it is sensible, persuasive, suggestive from beginning to end. Dr. Bower has, of course, said a number of things which the reader has heard before, which have been said before, but he says them with a new clarity and an incisiveness that calls for action as well as assent on the part of those who would hasten the day of more adequate and intelligent utilization of the Bible.

Haverford College

J. W. Flight

KNOWING THE BIBLE. *Raymond C. Knox*. Revised Edition. Macmillan Co., 1936. XV-227 pp. \$2.50.

Chaplain Knox's textbook re-appears in a well-deserved renewed edition. The selected bibliography, covering twelve pages, has been revised and enlarged and brought up to date; archaeological data have received additional recognition; and a brief description of the apocalyptic literature, coming "between the Testaments," has been added. This well-known textbook has retained all its former excellencies and with its improvements goes forth again as one of the best of its kind.

Two New College Text Books

STUDIES IN THE LIFE OF JESUS

By Irwin Ross Beiler

A. B., S. T. B., Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy and Religion,
Allegheny College

Studies in the Life of Jesus is an undergraduate textbook dealing with critical problems raised in theological seminaries.

Dr. Beiler introduces the student to the major critical problems involved in the study of Jesus. Conclusions to the problems are usually indicated. Opposing views are either sketched or the important literature concerning them is noted in the appendix. Although the author deals candidly with difficult questions, his treatment of the life of Jesus leaves upon readers and students a deep reverence.

The studies include: The oral traditions, the Synoptic sources, and the Gospel of John; the social and physical world of Jesus and the formative influences in His early life; His life work, the miracles, and the meaning of discipleship; Jesus as teacher, the Sermon on the Mount, the parables, and the Kingdom of God; What Jesus taught about poverty, wealth, the family, sin, and forgiveness; the last week; the growing greatness of Jesus.

There are three appendices: Supplementary Reading, The Miracles of Jesus (Synoptic), and The Parables of Jesus (Synoptic). The book is well indexed. **\$2.50**

A HISTORY OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH

By Wm. Scott

A. B., A. M., S. T. M., Th.D.
Professor of Religion, Randolph-
Macon Woman's College

A History of the Early Christian Church deals with the background, origin, environment and progress of the early Christian community. It is intended to satisfy a long recognized need for a practical, teachable textbook on the Apostolic age adequate for undergraduate work. After several years in the making, this textbook has been tested by classroom use and revised and perfected with the help of other professors and able authorities.

It includes a sketch of the historical and religious background of Jesus; an examination of the significance of his life and teaching in their relation to Judaism; and the story of the development of the Christian movement from a Jewish sect until it was adopted by Constantine as the religion of the Empire. This thesis is presented: The values embodied in Jesus' life and teaching were the determining factor in the various phases of the development of the Church throughout the period.

The book is marked by careful scholarship, clear and concise statement, and an appreciation of the spiritual forces operative in the various institutions and beliefs which interpret the meaning of Christ to the world. **\$2.50**

Examination Copies Sent on Request

Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.

A HISTORY OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH; by *William Scott, Th. D.* Cokesbury Press, Nashville. 1936. pp. 375. \$2.50.

Professor Scott has written a book which supplies a real need in the study of Christian origins. Nothing has done more to obscure the real significance of The New Testament than the practice of isolating it as a unique book, reflecting a phase of Christian history which stands altogether by itself. The impression is left on the minds of most people that between the New Testament age and that which followed, a great gulf is fixed. When the last Apostle laid down his pen a magic circle was broken, and there arose a new kind of gospel, working in a different world. It is the object of the present book to bring out the continuity of the early Christian movement. Within the New Testament period a number of phases in the movement succeeded each other, and the last of these phases merged just as naturally in one that lies outside of the New Testament border. The history runs on without a break from the ministry of Jesus to the time when his religion had established itself as the acknowledged religion of the world. As Professor Scott perceives, it is only when we break down the arbitrary barrier of the Canon and take the wider view that we can rightly understand what is given us in the New Testament itself.

The book does not profess to offer any revolutionary ideas on the beginning of Christianity or the course of its development. After careful study of the sources and the whole field of the modern literature, the author has formed his own conclusions as to the probable course of events. He has done this with admirable judgment, and with the single desire to ascertain what actually happened. In a work designed as a textbook it is a great merit not to be misleading; and those who

follow Professor Scott's guidance may always feel sure that they are getting the soundest results of modern scholarship and not the erratic opinions of one individual, who is anxious to show off his originality. A word of emphatic praise is due the arrangement of the book. Professor Scott has brought to his task the experience of a practical teacher, and has been at pains to make everything lucid and intelligible. He writes in a clear and natural style. He divides his chapters into short sections, each with its own heading. He diversifies his material, so that theological or ecclesiastical discussion is duly relieved by narrative. It will be a dull student indeed who is not interested in the book, and who does not leave it with a definite picture in his mind of how the church arose and spread itself over the world.

The novelty of the book is in the effort to bridge the gap between the origins and the later history of the Christian movement. The author has never allowed himself to forget that the New Testament period is only a fragment, which has to be fitted into a larger whole; and by bringing it into this context he has thrown new light both on the early history and on its sequel. His book should prove invaluable as a companion or supplement to the ordinary textbooks which deal with the New Testament alone.

Union Theological Seminary. *E. F. Scott*

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SOUL.

Rufus Jones. The Macmillan Company, 1936. VI, 215. \$2.00.

This is one of Professor Jones' best popular expositions. Written in a simple and clear style, it presents his sanely rational and moral type of mysticism in the light of important contributions made by others. He interprets Clement's "mutual and reciprocal correspondence," Gandhi's "soul force," and Bergson's "open religion," making each contribute to a

deeper insight into the powers and resources of the soul. He defends the dignity of the soul against the assaults of materialistic science on the one hand, and of Augustinian-Barthian theology on the other. While profoundly conscious of the social values in mysticism, he offers incisive and telling criticisms of Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison's one-sidedly social view of religion.

The book is not rigorous philosophy and is not meant to be. Here and there it may seem to some to be a bit sentimental. It disposes rather too casually of types of mysticism which do not conform to the pattern which the author approves. But the book is genuine, humble, beautiful and inspiring, and is the fruit of ripe experience and scholarship. It should have a wide reading in this age of chaos.

Edgar Sheffield Brightman

Boston University

THE GOD WHO SPEAKS. *Burnett Hillman Streeter.* The Macmillan Co. 1936. VII-224 pp. \$1.75.

This little book with its argument apriori, teleological, is warmly devout and closes very near to the point of view of the Oxford Movement.

The world needs, each one of us needs, a sense of direction. There is assuredly a "divinity that shapes." For the individual believer there is the possibility of guidance in the plan, or the will of God. The believer is one who is willing to try the method of conscience, the inner voice. He will, through prayer and contemplation, succeed in attuning his life to the divine will.

The lecturer, now the writer, is convinced that the voice within ought to be regarded as an authentic communication of the Divine. This communication is supported by the experi-

ences of religious persons throughout history to the present day. To illustrate this, the Bible is scanned in a brilliant running commentary of an inspirational, devotional character in order to show the march of the divine epic of the God who speaks and guides, "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good". The use of the biblical data is truly eloquent and tonic.

The biblical expert is advised to read the volume at a sitting, or a standing, so as to catch the movement and the thrill of this exposition of the divine plan for humanity in which the individual is encouraged to find his own participation and guidance, not only as between good and bad, but as between two goods.

Haverford College

Elihu Grant

THE ALEXANDRIAN HALAKAH IN APOLOGETIC LITERATURE OF THE FIRST CENTURY C. E. *Samuel Beikin.* Bloch Publishing Co., 1936. 70 pp. \$1.00.

It is an unusual pleasure for me to write about this little book by a student of mine of whom I am really proud, especially as I have the honor to share with Prof. Wolfson in the dedication of it. Dr. Belkin has a combination of qualifications which are rarely found together: to a thorough rabbinical training of the conservative sort in Europe he has added an appreciation of modern scholarly ideals and methods, and his devoted loyalty to his own faith has not prevented him from taking a keen and appreciative interest in the New Testament. Those who have read his articles in recent issues of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1935, pp. 41ff; 1936, pp. 227ff) will know what can be expected from one of such spirit and training who has also an unusually keen mind.

The present work has not such immediate bearing on biblical studies as have the articles

just referred to, but it will be found interesting and profitable reading by any person trying to understand the rich variety of Judaism in the New Testament period. As the first sentence of the book says, "The works of Philo and Josephus are the non-rabbinical and non-Christian sources which help us to understand the history of Judaism in the first century C. E." Dr. Belkin has noted and set forth various particulars in which the legal traditions reflected in the writings of Philo and Josephus differ from those that have come down to us in the standard rabbinic literature and has compared and attempted to explain them in the light of the apologetic purposes which animated the philosopher and the historian. The result is interesting for the student of the New Testament because, among other things, it confirms what we are more and more coming to see, how closely Palestinian and Alexandrian Judaism at this time were connected and how much in need of revision is our old, sharply drawn distinction between Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism. That there were differences, of course, and not two but many varieties of Jewish thought not only remains as true as ever but receives new confirmation, but it is clear that the main lines of cleavage can no longer be regarded as coinciding with geographical boundaries.

Dr. Belkin is still young, and his work thus

far shows such distinct promise that we may hope for many more studies from him which should constitute an important contribution to our understanding of first century Judaism, both for its own sake and as the background of early Christianity.

Yale University

Millar Burrows

THE MESSAGES OF ISRAEL. Edited by Israel H. Weisfeld. Bloch Publishing Co., 1936. XXXVII-285 pp. \$3.00.

Twenty-four noted American rabbis and scholars have contributed to this interpretation of Jewish faith. The expositions are based on the Jewish calendar—its fasts and feasts—New Year's Day, Day of Atonement, Tabernacles, Purim, Passover, Pentecost. Each contribution is prefaced by a brief biographical note of the respective author. There is an instructive introduction consisting of an historical survey of Jewish homiletics and its effect on Jewish religious life. The expositions, interspersed with Talmudic lore, illustrate Jewish exegesis as still in vogue in our time among the various shades of Jewish faith. The material should prove useful in courses on biblical interpretation as well as be conducive to mutual understanding between Jews and Christians.

Ismar J. Peritz

A Basic Bible Course for College Students

Part I—To 586 B. C.

Elmer W. K. Mould, Ph. D.

pp. xxiv + 209, quarto, double column, with maps, tables, glossary, index, lithoprinted, bristol binding, \$3.75

Prepared primarily for use at Elmira College

Available from

ELMIRA COLLEGE BOOKSTORE,
Elmira, New York.

WALKER'S COMPREHENSIVE CONCORDANCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. J. B. R. Walker. The Macmillan Co., 1936. New Edition. VI-957 pp. \$3.00.

Next to the Bible itself a reliable concordance is indispensable to the biblical student. This new edition of Walker's well-known concordance meets with all the requirements: it is handy, in clear type, well articulated, and reasonable in price.

The Recovery of Ideals

by **GEORGIA HARKNESS**

Professor of Philosophy at Elmira College, author of "Conflict and Religious Thought" and "The Resources of Religion", etc.

A constructive philosophy of life as opposed to the current depression in morale among young people is presented in this volume in non-technical language. Ideals rooted in action, not pleasant aspirations, are shown as the solution of today's problems and the puzzled and confused will be helped by its common sense and persuasive quality. The book will be especially useful to leaders of youth. **\$2.00**

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

The International Library of Christian Knowledge

Wm. Adams Brown, American Editor

The first three volumes have been acclaimed with universal approval. *The London Times* says the work deserves "the sincere appreciation and loyal support of the theological scholar and of the intellectual layman."

New Titles This Spring

The Beginnings of the Christian Church

By Hans Lietzmann

A first-hand re-examination and reinterpretation of the formative period of the Christian church by a great scholar. **Probably \$4.00**

The Philosophy of Religion

By Emil Brunner

A clear and systematic presentation of the underlying religious philosophy for which Karl Barth and Emil Brunner speak.

About \$2.00

A Fresh Approach to the Psalms

By W. O. E. Oesterley

Non-technical and simply presented, this volume will increase the readers understanding and appreciation of the Psalms.

About \$2.00

At All Bookstores

RELIGIOUS TRADITION AND MYTH

BY **ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH**

Professor Goodenough examines four historic sources—Judaism, Greek Philosophy, Greek Religion, and Mysticism,—and demonstrates what parts of them have dealt adequately with fundamental human problems, and what parts have necessarily to be discarded. His ideas suggest a new view of religion and the dynamic part it may play in the world of today. **\$1.50**

BY LIGHT, LIGHT. THE MYSTIC GOSPEL OF HELLENISTIC JUDAISM

By ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH

"In the elaboration of the details of what mystical Judaism revealed in Philo's allegories and elsewhere, Professor Goodenough marshals a vast body of material organized and interpreted with profound scholarship and presented with literary skill." *THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY* **\$5.00**

THE HEBREW-ARABIC DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE

Edited by SOLOMON L. SKOSS

This is the earliest comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible that has come down to us, dating from the tenth century. It includes numerous comparisons of Hebrew roots with Arabic and Aramaic, and is an indispensable aid to students of the Old Testament, as well as of Hebrew and comparative Semitic philology. **\$7.50**

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

STANDARD BOOKS *on Bible Study*

KNOWING THE BIBLE

By Raymond C. Knox

A new and completely revised edition of this widely accepted standard text. Much important information, based on recent archeological discoveries, has been added. **\$2.50**

SOME STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By H. F. B. Mackay

A companion volume to Canon Mackay's *Some Studies in the Old Testament*. It shows the same "singular gift for discovering the forgotten elements in scenes and situations that have become old and familiar." **\$2.00**

THE GOSPEL PARABLES

By W. O. E. Oesterley

The Gospel parables are presented in the light of the most recent research into rabbinical literature. Each is considered from the point of view of its Jewish environment. **\$2.50**

COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE

By J. R. Dummelow

The best complete one-volume commentary for the pastor and teacher available at this low price. **\$2.50**

WALKER'S COMPREHENSIVE CON- CORDANCE to the HOLY SCRIPTURES

By J. B. R. Walker

A serviceable and scholarly concordance on the Authorized (King James) Version of the Bible. The references are arranged in strict alphabetical order and include 50,000 more than any other concordance. **\$3.00**

At all bookstores or from

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY : 60 Fifth Avenue, New York

A catalogue of our religious publications upon request